Free Press

The Philanthropist.

PUBLISHED BY THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF THE OHIO STATE ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY.

We are verily guilty concerning our brother * * * * * * therefore is this distress come upon us.

AMALIEL BAILEY, Jr., Editor. SAMUEL A. ALLEY, Printer.

VOLUME II. NO. 46 NEW SERIES. CINCINNATI, TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 4, 1840. WHOLE NO. 197.

THE PHILANTHROPIST,

PUBLISHED WEEKLY BY THE ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY

Main st., between 4th & 5th, East side.

CINCINNATI, OHIO.

TERMS.—Two Dollars and fifty cents in advance.—Three Dollars if not paid till the expiration of the year. Letters on business should be directed to the *Publishing Agent*; those relating to the editorial department, to the EDITOR. In all cases post paid.

Terms of Advertising.

One square of 16 lines, or less, one insertion,	$ 0 50
each additional insertion,	0 38
" for 6 months, without alteration	5 00
" " with alterations,	6 00
" " 1 year " "	10 00

A discount of 20 per. cent. on all advertisements occupying one half, two-thirds or an entire column.

DEBATES IN CONGRESS.

House of Representatives.

Wednesday, January 15, 1840.

Mr. COLES, of Virginia, having moved that the following be added to the Standing Rules and Orders of the House:

"All petitions, memorials, and papers touching the abolition of slavery, or the buying, selling, or transferring of slaves in any State, District, or Territory of the United States shall, upon their presentation, be laid on the table without being debated printed, read, or referred, and no further action whatever shall be had thereon."

After some remarks from Mr. COLES, (heretofore published,) and other incidental proceedings thereon, Mr. Thompson of South Carolina, moved to lay the resolution on the table, in order to enable him to offer another, which was read for information, as follows:

"Upon the presentation of any memorial or petition praying for the abolition of slavery and the slave-trade in any District, Territory, or State of the Union, and upon the presentation of any resolution or other paper touching these subjects, the question of the reception of such memorial, petition, resolution, or paper shall be considered as made, and the question of its reception shall be laid upon the table without debate or further action of the House."

And the motion to lay the resolution of Mr. Coles on the table having passed in the affirmative—

Mr W THOMPSON said he was sure there was no man who would doubt the fidelity of the gentleman who had offered the resolution which he (Mr. T.) had proposed to lay upon the table, to the best interests of the South and of the country upon this question. But (continued Mr. T.) when my friend asserts that his resolution is the same as mine, I think he is infinitely mistaken. They are as wide apart as the poles. My proposition is, that the question of reception shall be made and laid on the table. I know we have a right to reject these petitions. I do not doubt it—but I have just as little doubt that that right will not be conceded.

What then are we to do? Receive the petitions and lay them on the table. How can we lay them on the table if we do not receive them? If we lay them on the table, can we not take any other action upon them? And does not the gentleman see that in conceding the question of reception he has conceded all that is vital? Does it not erect this body into a platform for the perpetual agitation of this subject? Does it not subject me to the daily torture of having my feelings goaded and my people slandered by men on this floor who would not be received as overseers on our plantations—men who would not dare to breathe their vile calumnies but for the safety which they find by skulking behind the protection of this House! They are not the men, sir, to do it, if they did not know themselves to be thus protected. I say I hold this as vital; and he who knows any thing of the progress of abolition in Great Britain knows that as late as the year 1820 all purpose of abolition was disavowed, and all that they wanted was a platform in the House of Commons from which to agitate upon this question.

I know that there are honorable men of both parties who desire to put this thing down at home, and I am willing to give them every facility so long as I can do so without conceding a vital principle. There are all around me men in regard to whom I should belie my own feelings if I were to regard them as tainted with this dangerous fanaticism. But I cannot yield this principle. I must say to gentlemen with whom I have been associated here, if in nothing else, in opposition to the profligacy and corruption of this Administration, that the People of the South can regard no question as paramount to this. It is with me *the* question, and those who sustain me and my people from insult to their rights and outrage upon their feelings are my friends; and if gentlemen cannot take the responsibility of the vote, if they cannot stand at home by taking this ground, the more the pity—the more deeply is it to be regretted.

If I might be permitted to give a word of advice upon a matter in which I am so deeply interested, I would say to them, "take the bull by the horns"—the only way to overcome real danger is to look it full in the face; gentlemen have given this subject importance by investing it with dangers which do not belong to it.

I believe that the vast majority of the Northern People are sound on this subject—more disposed to take strong ground, and put down this dangerous fanaticism, than their Representatives—as the People generally are, on all great questions, bolder, because more disinterested than their Representatives. I know, too, that a large portion of the Representatives on this floor are ready to take their stand in putting down this infamous faction, but cannot vote with us on the question of reception, although as untainted with abolitionism as I am—men of as high honor, elevated patriotism, and generous intrepidity as any living.

Mr. Gates here interrupted Mr. Thompson, and said he hoped the gentleman would not include him among those [illegible] him who agreed with him in sentiment.

Mr. Thompson. Oh no, sir; I did not allude to the gentleman. I was speaking of high honor, elevated patriotism, generous intrepidity. I surely did not refer to the gentleman.

Mr. T. concluded by saying that he had not heretofore trusted himself to speak upon this subject. He knew that he never could speak with coolness and self-command upon it, and had therefore forborne, as much as he could, from mingling in the discussion—if, indeed, a Southern man is justifiable, which he doubted, in opening his mouth upon it, even to denounce it.

Mr. T. moved the previous question, but, on the appeal of Mr. Granger, saying that he desired to reply to Mr. T.'s denunciations, Mr. T. said, "I withdraw it—I withdraw it."

Mr. MONROE, of New York, then addressed the Chair as follows: Mr. Speaker, I propose to occupy the time of the House but a few minutes, and that only in defining my position on this all-absorbing question. My sentiments are well known at home, they having always been freely declared, and I will frankly tell my Southern friends that they have made a false issue on the right of petition with the non-slaveholding states. I beseech them as friends, I implore them as brethren, born under the same southern sun, inheriting the like feelings and principles, to pause and to reflect.

I am here, a Representative from a non-slaveholding state—just in her wishes, ardent in her patriotism, and as chivalrous in her feelings as her sister states of the south, for whom the gentleman from South Carolina who has just preceded me claims so much.

On this subject of abolition I every where express my sentiments openly and freely, and no where more distinctly and with higher approbation than among those whom I have the honor to represent. In proof of this, I intend to read to the House a letter which I addressed to the nominating committee of the City of New York just before the last election for members of Congress. It had been intimated before the late election in New York, by a few individuals, that if I were nominated, the abolitionists would not give me their support. Confiding in the just sentiments of the North, I at once met the intimation by informing the committee that, if elected, I would maintain the property right of masters in their slaves, as secured by the Constitution of the Federal Union.

I will ask the Clerk to read the letter.

NEW YORK, OCT. 18, 1838.

LAMBERT SUYDAM, Esq., *Chairman of the Whig Nominating Committee:*

Dear Sir,—I understand that a few of my personal opponents of the Whig party have at last been forced to declare the true ground of their opposition. Finding that my friends met most triumphantly every charge put forth to defeat my nomination for Congress, they resort at the last moment to the allegation that, having my birth in the South, the abolitionists will not give me their support. This I deny, and take the issue, as I iss[illegible] as I doubt not with every honorable Whig, and the patriots of all parties and sects, including the abolitionists themselves—whether the Union can preserved, and, indeed, whether it is worth preserving, under such sectional proscription, and my constitutional opinions not asked, but, from my birth, assumed.

I thank the gentleman for the compliment to my native state, implied in the assumption that, wherever fate or fortune may have cast one of her sons, he cannot be tampered with upon constitutional rights. Most sincerely do I regret the issue, and deeply do I deplore the declaration—not for self, God knows! but for our country—the Union. Is the South to be told that one of her sons whose father freely shed his blood in our Revolutionary struggle, cannot be presented for your suffrage because Virginia, under the constitutional compact, holds slaves as property, while the People of the East and the North held them under the same guaranty, and from interest, or feeling, if you please, thought proper to liberate them? I will not here take up your time, or so far insult your patriotism as to go into the discussion, though I am ready to do so on any suitable occasion.

The indulgence of my feelings in regard to slavery has made me, years since, a practical abolitionist, when I liberated the few slaves who formed my only inheritance, and, by so doing, left myself without a dollar. I beg not to be understood as urging this in plea for myself, or in censure of the South. I had the right to liberate my slaves, and exercised it; others in the South think proper to hold theirs, and we have not the constitutional right to say they shall not.

Whenever this question shall be forced upon the South, the constitutional compact is dissolved. Leave the South to themselves, and they will be found, in due time, not less patriotic, generous, and even religious than ourselves on this most momentous subject. The same cause will operate there which operated in the Eastern States, New York, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and Delaware.

But to the point—the object of this communication is to request that my friends will not allow my name to be put in nomination under even so much as an implied pledge that it is necessary in any manner to countenance the idea that there is any right in the East, the North, or the West, forcibly to disturb the South in their right under the Federal compact. Though I do not believe the abolitionists propose to dissolve the Union, I must repel every attempt to *identify* the Whigs with their cause; and while I will never permit my individual pretensions to interfere with the policy of the party, I must protest at the outset against the surrender of our principles to any man, or number of men, who claim to misinterpret or misrepresent the sentiments of the party.

I respect the feelings of all worthy men, and doubt not there are as patriotic citizens in the abolition ranks as any portion of the Union can boast; but by violence they retard the cause they desire to promote. This remark is equally applicable to the South in the discussion of the question. Please read this letter to the Whig Nominating Committee, who will pardon me for having taken up so much of their time.

I am, with much respect and esteem,

your obedient servant, JAS. MONROE.

Now, Mr. Speaker, (said Mr. M.) let my southern friends on this floor look to the sentiments expressed on that occasion, and mark also the result. With my views fairly before the people, I was elected by a majority of some 1,500. Than this no more decisive proof could be given by my constituents of their manly support of all that is established or secured in behalf of the slaveholding States by the Federal Constitution, and that a much higher degree of justice and liberality very generally exists throughout the non slaveholding states, in reference to the subject of slavery, than southern gentlemen on this floor have imagined.

I admit also that there is sufficient apology for their excitement and solicitude in the vile slanders and outrageous pretensions of the abolitionists who, under the assumed garb of religion, are insulting the feelings of the South, disregarding and trampling under foot their dearest rights; and, in their erring zeal, losing sight, not only of justice and patriotism, but of Christianity itself. In all deference and kindness, I must say that the abolition battle in the North must be fought by us of the North. Our Southern friends cannot aid us there, but will certainly break down among us the supporters of their vested rights by opposing on this floor the right of petition, even on the subject of abolition.

I shall not here go into a discussion of that right. All I ask is, to let the friends of law and constitutional rights in the North fight this battle in their own way. And, if I can be mistaken, by any possibility, in giving to the non-slaveholding states entire credit for sincerity and good faith on this great question, I am most anxious to know it. Therefore, all that I claim on the score of justice and manifest propriety is, that the petitions in question be received, referred, and reported upon. I care not how strong the language used, in the full recognition of southern rights and southern interests, when such report shall be made. I sustain the broadest ground claimed by the South, in the unqualified denial that there is any sanction, even by implication, to disturb the property-right of any citizen of this nation, as secured to him under the Constitution. And I feel myself authorized in asserting that I stand not alone, but have to aid me in this position the great majority of Northern members of this House.

And, while the South deny that the right of petition is involved, or that there is any grievance imposed upon the abolitionists, still the abolitionists, and others, too, do complain that the right of petition is denied and violated, thus mystifying their true position, and involving with their own assumption a principle which is unquenchable, and inherent with the people of every free Government. If the South, in a generous spirit, will take this ground from under them, leaving the friends of the country to fight unshackled the battle in the North upon its true merits, then there is nothing to fear from the consequences—consequences which, from the present apparent course and determination, are now looked to with such intense anxiety by every lover of the Union.

I implore the South not to be led away or diverted by designing politicians, who look more to their personal interests and individual advancement, than to the great interests of the country; and not to be caught in the traps of political demagogues, so as to be induced, in their generous feeling and abiding confidence, to make a party question of that: and whether we are, or are not, to remain a united people.

Let us take any other question, if we are to go on a crusade for political capital—some question that can be shaken off at the moment as a mere matter of the day. I will join them in any thing, as a lover of the Union, that may divert the politicians who are *now aiding*, by their course and by their action, the abolition cause: and I am almost ready to declare that, to effect this, I will go with them even on the monstrous and absurd doctrine of Sub-treasury.

A distinguished Senator has, by his course in the other Chamber of this Capitol, (and no one regards him with more personal respect and esteem than myself,) made more abolitionists than the best friend of the abolitionists has been able to make; and as that gentleman is now absorbed in his plans for remodelling the finances of the country, and re-establishing, as he declares, the "Jeffersonian platform," I hope he may remain for the next five years as much occupied as he is now by the same subject; for thereby we may indulge the hope that he will forget, for the time, that there is such a being as a slave in the South, or an abolitionist in the North!

I pledge my word to my friends of the South, that they are in error when they allow themselves to believe that the Whig party of the North is at all identified, or acknowledge any affinity, with the abolitionists.

In evidence of which, and of the intention of the Administration party to identify the Whigs with abolitionism, I shall state a case: A gentleman who held a seat for years on this floor, which is now occupied by myself, or one of my immediate colleagues, (from the city of New York,) declared to me, I think the day after the election closed in New York in 1838 for members of Congress, he having been a candidate, that the Whig party had identified themselves with the abolitionists. I told him that I could not see in what particular; that I was the last man to recognise such union; and that I had the strongest evidence of the contrary in the declaration and course of my political friends. I told him that he could not have seen my letter to the Whig nominating committee, in which I had taken the boldest Southern ground upon that question; and that the sentiments therein contained had been sustained and responded to, as my election had proved; that I was happy to say that neither his party nor mine, so far as I knew, had allowed themselves to respect or regard the abolitionists at all, and that this was the most gratifying characteristic of the contest through which we had just passed.

It was further said that the Whig party would be identified with, and as the advocates of, the abolitionists, and that *they* (the Administration party) would make them so. Such a course was pronounced then as highly unjust: but soon after there was some proof that it had been attempted, in a paper sent to me, I think from North Carolina, the native State of the gentleman to whom I allude, and who was the Hon. C. C. Cambreleng.

The Whigs, *in* their honesty and confidence, allowed themselves to repose, while the opposite party were endeavoring to identify them, throughout the South, with the abolition cause.

These facts induced the publication of the letter which was just read.

Pending the canvass, the abolitionists sent letters containing interrogatories referable to their principles of action and views of the subject, to the candidates of each party; and it was requested that a communication should be made to our political opponents to meet us, and in this question bury all party feeling; to meet the question boldly and fearlessly, as lovers of the Union. Whether such communication was made to them or not, I am unable to say: but a meeting of the candidates, now members of this House, was held, and letters written in answer to the abolition interrogatories, as bold in character and warm in sentiment in defence of Southern interests and rights as any member of this House could desire. It was, however, decided that they (the abolitionists) had stated that if no answer was given their communication, it would be considered by them as a negative to each query propounded; that is to say, that the candidates were decidedly opposed to the course of the abolitionists; whereupon their decision was made, and no answer given. What course our political opponents, in reference to the same queries, pursued, I know not, as I made no inquiries; but have no reason to doubt that equally with ourselves they promptly rejected the proffered alliance with the abolitionists.

To a gentleman from the South, and a member of this House, within a few days past I expressed my convictions of the honest and patriotic feelings of the North, and urged upon him that he and his friends should disconnect, as an act of honest and generous confidence in the North, the right of petition from the abolition assumptions; declaring to him that if the issue was pressed in its connexion, they would drive every high-minded friend of the South from the floor of Congress, and that their places would be filled by demagogues and unprincipled aspirants, who were as reckless of consequences as they were indifferent to the best interests of the Union. That the seats of their friends now on this floor would be occupied by abolitionists, and those in the interest of abolitionists, who would not only contend for the right of petition, but jump over that, and disturb the property-rights of the South under the Federal compact. Mr. Speaker, however the South may now seem to disregard the right of petition, it must be recollected that Virginia, feeling the pressure of her wrongs under the colonial system, refused to come into the Union until the right of petition, under the Federal compact as declared in the amendments to the Constitution, was fully recognised. That the North has, in part, taken the principle, guarding this right, from Virginia, and is now as decided in its assertion, and as unyielding in insisting upon that right, as ever Virginia was in demanding its recognition by the Constitution. Thus will be seen the importance of separating the abolition question from the right of petition: one asserting a constitutional right—the other, if you please, claiming the right to violate the Constitution. All the North asks of the South is to respect and sustain the right of petition; and that the subject of the memorials of the abolitionists may be presented to Congress as mere constitutional questions standing in an isolated position and distinct form.

[Here Mr. M. proceeded to refer to the recent correspondence between Governors Campbell, of Virginia, and Seward, of New York, when he was called to order by the Speaker as departing from the subject of debate. The cries of "Order!" "proceed!" "go on!" &c., prevented the reporter from hearing the remarks which immediately followed.]

Mr. M. resumed. Mr. Speaker, my health will not allow me much longer to trespass on the indulgence of the House, but I cannot take my seat without again appealing to the patriotism of my friends of the South to divest this question of all party, and, if possible, of all local connexion, to view it calmly, receive the petitions, and then treat them as they deserve. Answer them, if you please, and in the strongest language, that action on the part of Congress in this matter, involving so deeply the right of property, is IMPOSSIBLE, because not constitutionally within the power of Congress.

And I feel bound to say, further, in justice to myself, and to those who hear me, that should it ever happen—which God forbid!—that the opposing interest on this question is ever to be upheld by the rival parties elsewhere than upon the floor of this House, I shall be found, side by side, with my brethren of the South battling—even to the shedding of my blood—in vindication, as I esteem it to be, of their great and inalienable constitutional privileges. [Faugh!—ED. PHIL.]

Mr. M. then offered the following resolution as a substitute for that offered by his friend, the gentleman from South Carolina, (Mr. Thompson:)

"That all petitions, memorials, resolutions, and addresses of every description, touching the abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia, or in the States or Territories, or in any manner relating to the existence of slavery or the slave-trade in the United States, be referred, without debate, to a select committee, with instructions to consider and report thereon."

Mr. GRANGER rose and said: Mr. Speaker: Before proceeding to the question before the House, permit me to say to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. W. Thompson) that, after having debated a proposition in the manner in which he debated that now under consideration, it was not like him to demand the previous question, without affording to other gentlemen an opportunity of reply. Permit me also to say that, when a moment's reflection had taught him that he might have done injustice, it was like him to withdraw that demand.

It is necessary for us, as the Representatives of the People of this nation, to carry our minds back a little, to ascertain how it is that we arrived at the point at which we now are. Who is there from the South—who is there from the North—who is there in this broad universe that looks to this as a land of freedom—who could have believed that, in one short half century from the formation of the Government, the People of the United States would have arrived at a position presenting them before the nations of the earth as we are now presented!—a position that would show that a People boasting more of freedom than any upon earth are the veriest slaves to local opinion that can be found on the habitable globe? I speak not this in any feeling of unkindness towards any one. I know how strong are local circumstances. I admit myself to be probably as strongly bound by them—as much influenced by the effects they may produce, as any gentleman in this Hall; but still, sir, it is due to myself, to the petitioners, and to the cause upon which I am now speaking, to declare—what every man who knows me well knows—that I never have been, and am not now, an abolitionist; so far from it, indeed, that gentlemen who know my course, and have thought it of sufficient consequence to notice it, are well informed that, whilst I have felt myself, in courtesy, and from considerations of personal respect, bound to answer questions propounded to me by the abolitionists, my answers to those questions have not met with their unqualified approbation.

But I am called to meet here a question which forces the battle of abolitionism to be fought on the right of petition; and let me tell gentlemen upon this floor, that is an issue from which the abolitionists of the North, do not shrink. And why? Because they know that the universal feeling of the North is, that this right of petition has been outraged here; and no matter how party drill may have been applied to sustain men in power—Northern men with Southern principles—let me tell you that gentlemen dare not at home advocate the doctrines which here they virtually, at least, approve by their votes. Let me tell you that gentlemen who, upon this question, leave their seats and are found among the wounded and the missing, know that, in following the requirements of party, they are going against their own solemn convictions, and against the sober feeling of the constituency which they represent. But I do not feel at liberty longer to detain the House upon these matters, and I will proceed at once to the question before us.

The gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. W. Thompson) has been speaking of these petitioners, and declaring them all to be contemptible—men whom he would not employ as overseers on his plantation. It is true he would not, sir, for they are men who acknowledge no master but the God who made them, and can never be commanded except when their blood may be wanted in defence of the Constitution and the laws of their country. Let me tell the gentleman that, however they may differ from him on this question, there are those whose names will be found upon these petitions not inferior to him in standing, in character, in talents, in wealth, in influence with their fellow-men; men who, like him, if the interests or the honor of their country should be assailed, would defend them at the cannon's mouth—men who were at the battles of Lundy's Lane and Bridgewater, and who mingled in the sortie from Fort Erie.

I come now, Mr. Speaker, to the history of the proceedings of this House on abolition petitions. Any gentleman who will go back to the records of this House will find that for five and twenty years this question has been presented here, and the petitions have been received under the guaranty of the Constitution of our country, and have been referred to the appropriate committee to which, I think, gentlemen will finally refer those which will be hereafter presented. It chanced that, in the year 1836, from considerations of patriotism or of political calculation, it was found necessary to object to the reception of these petitions in this House, and then it was that a flame was kindled, not by abolitionists, but by gentlemen representing a country which for five and twenty years had submitted to this outrage, as it is called, and who never before had suspected that the rights and the honor of their people were invaded. This is a fact rather material in this business, and which can be established by the records of this House. A proposition was then made by a gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. Pinckney) to refer these petitions, without being read, to a committee, that they might be reported on. Every body felt that a blow had thus been struck at the right of petition; but local feeling, local patriotism, and, probably, local fear, carried these petitions to a committee, who reported resolutions which could not, for a moment, have stood an argument upon their merits. The gag-law was applied—and that, too, upon the most important constitutional question that had for years been presented to this House; not an hour's discussion was allowed.

Well, what next! At the next session, an honorable gentleman from Virginia (Mr. Patton) introduced a resolution that went a little further to confine this right of petition. The resolution was passed in the same manner as the former. This violent and unconstitutional action having got to a point where it was well to show that not only Southern men dare do these things, but that Northern gentlemen, if not imbued with Southern principles, were at least ready to lend themselves to Southern action and Southern views for the benefit of Northern men—then, I say, it was that a gentleman from a free State (Mr. Atherton) was found ready to present a gag resolution tied down by the previous question, to be voted upon, not only by gentlemen from the South who perchance felt bound to do it, but by gentlemen from the North who were bound by a stronger tie—a political tie which I am free to admit, with the gentleman from South Carolina, has secured a course of action here contrary to the public voice—a course of action forcing a mental debasement which Southern slaveholders would never attempt to force even upon their slaves. But, sir, at last we have arrived at a point a little beyond that. And what is the proposition? It is to incorporate in the rules and orders of the Representative Assembly of the only free Government on the face of the earth an order that no paper shall even be received which even presumes to speak upon questions involving personal liberty. Here is a position so beautiful as connected with the representative system of this Government—so perfectly in accordance with those Jeffersonian principles of which we hear so much—so perfectly consistent with what is the present democracy and republicanism of this country, that we are called upon to send forth to the world as a standing order of the House, that any petition which may have been offered at your doors involving questions of personal liberty is not entitled even to the poor consideration of being placed upon the journals! Has it come to this! Can it be that in a Government like ours, in the very morning of our existence, we have arrived at a point where the only proposition that may not be discussed is a question involving the liberty or slavery of man? I ask you, sir, is this the way to convince the nations of the earth that our institutions are to endure? If it be true that we have engrafted upon our system principles which will not bear even discussion—if it be true that there is fastened upon us, by the Constitution and the laws, that which cannot be discussed now, when we are in the vigor of our days, when lusty manhood courses through our veins, and all is action, force, and energy, what is to be the condition of our country when probably she will be saddled with debt, when corruption crawling in upon us through every avenue of patronage shall have brought us to the position of the old Governments of the world, and when, in addition to their burdens and corruptions, we shall be borne down by a system which gentlemen say cannot and must not even meet discussion?

In turning from this part of the subject, I will take occasion to remark that there is no man here who will hold more sacred than I will, the constitutional engagements upon which we have entered, so long, as they exist. But this nation is not to be kept quiet by any such course as is here adopted. Men who feel no interest in this question in relation to slavery in the District of Columbia—men who are amongst the first to sustain and uphold the Constitution of your country unbroken, feel that the right of petition has been invaded, and that, if it can once be violated here, it can be upon other occasions—men who feel that, in this Government above all others, it is essential that the friends of freedom should resist every encroachment in the beginning. And my colleague (Mr. Monroe) spoke truly when he said that, if this question was urged in its present form you would find enlisted under the banner of the abolitionists, that they may there fight in the cause of the right of petition, many gallant spirits who will never yield to fierce denunciations, and who, when they feel that their rights are invaded, will show to the world that citizens of the South are not the only freemen possessing moral force; that the South is not the only part of this nation which knows its rights, or, knowing, dare maintain them.

Before I conclude, permit me to say a word to the gentleman from Louisiana, (Mr. Chinn.) That gentleman, in a spirit of liberality that, considering the position in which he is placed, could arise only from patriotic impulse, asked for a suspension of the rule to introduce a certain proposition. I was unwilling to vote for the suspension, because I did not believe, nor do I now believe, that, before a single petition has been presented, it is right, or within the spirit of the Constitution, to lay down a course of action upon petitions involving questions of personal freedom, different from that which would have been pursued in the ordinary business of the House. But if the gentleman, upon the presentation of these petitions, had offered his resolution, adding instructions to a committee to report thereon, his proposition would have received my vote. I am not of those who believe that the time of the House should be consumed in reading petitions of this or any other character, and I feel it due to those who, in common with myself, offer them, to say that their reading never has been called for, so far as I recollect, except when gentlemen have been driven to it by feeling that they have been treated with severity; that their constituents were wounded through them; and that the Constitution of their country had received a still deeper wound than was inflicted on these petitioners. I trust the proposition of the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. Chinn) which I suppose to be substantially the same as that of my colleague from the city of New York, (Mr. Monroe,) will be so framed as to refer these petitions to a committee to be reported on. But I am unwilling to incorporate such a proposition among the standing rules of this House. I do not believe that it becomes the Representatives of the People of this nation to send forth to the world a rule which will show that we contemplate the presentation of petitions which cannot be acted upon in the usual way, and I do believe that if the gentleman from Louisiana will at the proper time, present his proposition, when petitions shall be presented, that it will receive the unanimous vote at least of all those who agree with me on this floor.

Sir, there is no gentleman in this nation who regrets more sincerely than I that this question should have been agitated. But I am not willing that those with whom I am associated—men whose lives are as pure, and whose standing in the community that sent them is equal to that of any gentleman here—men who would scorn to do any thing that would not bear the light of day, and whose every action is marked by a disinterested patriotism—are to be regarded as unworthy of consideration, merely because they may entertain a conscientious difference of opinion upon matters of public policy. I say it is not becoming the courtesy of this House. Where shall we find ourselves if this Hall is to be made the scene of personal recrimination upon these questions? We stand here the Representatives of a People claiming to be free. Our duty is to see the Constitution and laws of the country preserved inviolate. In doing so, whilst we invade no right belonging to the South, we will never permit the South to trample upon the rights which have been secured to the North by that Constitution. And here let me say, sir, that the clause of the Constitution guarantying the sacredness of this right for which we contend, and engrafted upon that instrument in the form of an amendment, was presented by the State which you in part represent on this floor. I therefore call upon old Virginia, the State which *would not take* the Constitution until a clause had been inserted sufficiently securing this right—I call upon her to see that an amendment which she herself affixed to that sacred instrument is not now trampled in the dust.

Mr. CRABB said he would not now trouble the House with any remarks were it not for reasons personal to himself. He had desired the motion for the previous question, submitted by the gentleman from South Carolina, (Mr. THOMPSON,) to be persisted in, notwithstanding he entertained then the same disposition to say a few words that he did at the present time. And, as it had pleased that gentleman to withdraw that motion for the benefit of others, he should avail himself of the withdrawal to say what he had long considered it due to himself to say, that his opinions and views on this agitated and agitating subject might be properly understood, both here and in the country. And in doing this, Mr. C. assured the House he had no intention whatever to discuss the subject of abolition proper. He merely desired to place himself right in relation to his previous course upon this floor, and to say a word or two in relation to the right of petition.

The previous course of this House upon the matter now before it had been referred to, and, among other acts of this House, its adoption of the resolutions offered at the last session of Congress upon this subject by the honorable gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. ATHERTON) had been brought in review before this body on the present occasion. One of those resolutions, Mr. C. said, he had felt it his incumbent duty to oppose at the last session, and on that account he had been classed, as he was informed at the time by a colleague, along with the members of that Congress opposed to the *gag*, so called by the conductor of a foul print published in the State of New York, friendly to the cause of abolition. He had contemplated a publication at the time in refutation of that classification of himself, but was dissuaded from noticing it on account of its origin being unworthy alike of his notice and of public belief. In regard, however, to the latter, he was, perhaps, somewhat mistaken. There were those who believed, or *pretended to believe*, that he was properly classed by that print, and the article was copied in his own district, and used against his re-election during the last canvass. He therefore took this occasion to say explicitly, that, so far as he had opposed at the last session of Congress one of the series of resolutions submitted by the honorable gentleman from New Hampshire, (Mr. ATHERTON,) he had done so not because it was a *gag*, but *merely* because it was not, in relation to the subject now under consideration, a *sufficient gag* for his purposes; because it did not, as he construed it, go far enough and strong enough towards a *refusal of any countenance whatever on this floor to abolition petitions*.

This [said Mr. C.] was the plain ground of his objection to the resolution of the last session disposing of abolition petitions, and the same objection still remained with him in full force to all similar propositions. And he would say to his political friends, and to all on that floor opposed to the jurisdiction of Congress over this subject, that the ground he took was the only tenable ground upon which they must sooner or later rally in defence of the *peculiar institution* of the Southern States. Nor did he conceive that by favoring a rejection of *such* petitions, he violated or infringed in the least the constitutional and *sacred* right of petition. What [asked Mr. C.] is that right? It is, that Congress shall pass no law abridging the right of the People peaceably to assemble and petition to the Government for a redress of grievances. *Whose* grievances have any portion of the People a constitutional right to petition for a redress of? Why, to be sure, *their own* grievances and *none others*. One man, or set of men, has no strict *constitutional* right to petition for a redress of grievances, *real or supposed*, of another man or set of men. If it were even conceded to Congress that it has any authority over this subject, what right, Mr. C. demanded, had the people of a non-slaveholding State, first, *to assume*, what was by no means admitted, that the slaveholding States were laboring under a grievance in this matter, and then, *in the capaciousness and plenitude of their pretended or mistaken charity*, to petition Congress to redress that *supposed* grievance! Sir, [said Mr. C.] no such right exists, and it is no infringement whatever of the *sacred* right of petition promptly to deny the existence of such right whenever and by whomsoever claimed on this floor.

But, in another point of view, the constitutional right of petition is not impaired in the least by refusing to receive petitions in favor of abolition. There exists no constitutional authority in Congress to legislate upon this subject in conformity with the prayer of those petitions. This being the case, and the right of petition to Congress being only as broad as, and no broader than the constitutional authority of Congress, what right has Congress to receive petitions on a subject, and what right have the citizens to prefer petitions to Congress on a subject, over which Congress possesses no authority? If you concede the point that Congress has no jurisdiction over the subject of those petitions, then are we under no obligation, nor have we any right to assume jurisdiction by receiving them; and, if you assert the jurisdiction of Congress in the premises, and its power to grant the prayer of the petitioners, then are you abolitionists, and we ask and expect nothing at your hands. The right of petition, then, in this point of view, is not at all impaired or abridged by a refusal to receive petitions upon a subject in relation to which Congress can rightfully exercise no legislation whatever.

But there is still another point of view [said Mr. C.] in which he deemed it perfectly competent for the House to reject petitions without any violation of the right of petition; and he thought the acute intellectual discernment of the talented gentlemen who represent the Northern States on this floor could not fail to perceive and recognize it as perfectly logical and legitimate reasoning. In what does the right of petition consist, as understood by us at the present time, and what constitutes an exercise of that right? It consists in the privilege or permission to prepare a written statement of some grievance under which the petitioners, or persons intimately associated with them, labor, and a prayer for a redress thereof by Governmental authority; and its exercise consists in the act of drawing such an instrument, and in the presentation thereof personally, or by representative, to the authority addressed. This is the sum and substance of the right, and the consummation of its exercise. A point must necessarily be fixed at which *the right of petition* ceases, and at which the action thereon, of the body petitioned, commences. That point is the *presentation* of the petition, at which juncture the action of the petitioner ceases, and the action of the body petitioned commences. As to what the body petitioned should do, when the petition is presented, it does not enter and constitute any portion of the right of petition, but it forms a distinct thing—it forms a portion of the duty of the body petitioned, in regard to which the petitioners, in common with all other citizens, have a common interest. If, therefore, the body petitioned possess no jurisdiction of the subject to which the petition relates, it becomes its duty, much more its right, at once to reject the petition as asking what is not within the constitutional competency and power of the body petitioned to grant. In this point of view [Mr. C. said] he held it to be the duty of all who do not recognize in Congress the power to grant the prayer of abolition petitions to vote for their immediate rejection, thus saying promptly and firmly to the petitioners, you ask what we have no right to grant, if we were even disposed to do so. Take away, therefore, your petition; we cannot consider it, because we are inhibited from exercising jurisdiction over the subject in accordance with your prayer. And [said Mr. C.] it must be perceived, upon calm reflection and a dispassionate consideration of the subject, which he invited, that the course proposed to be pursued with these petitions, by himself and friends, was much more respectful—if *disrespect* be the ground of complaint—than to receive them, and then cast them in a corner, without reference or consideration. Indeed, it appeared to him that the *reception* of the petitions devolved an obligation on all who vote for the reception, to consider the facts stated in the petitions and their prayer; and it was for this, among other reasons, that he could not obtain his own consent to vote for their reception, or any resolution proposing a course tantamount thereto.

Mr. C. repeated that he had said what he had, more in explanation and vindication of his former and intended course, than with a view or expectation of influencing the course of any other member. He was always disposed to leave others as he desired to be left himself, to a free and unbiassed exercise of judgment, formed upon that reflection and intellectual independence which should ever characterize an American statesman. He had, he believed, said nothing of a personally offensive character to any one on that floor, and therefore did not feel that in making the motion which he intended to make in conclusion, he could be charged with illiberality, or as wanting in that spirit of generosity which had been said to distinguish the section of country from whence he came, and which, he would add, he had no doubt was possessed to an abundant extent by his fellow-citizens of the North, the East, and the West. His sole object was to terminate a debate which, notwithstanding his anxiety to say what he had just submitted, he was anxious should have terminated at the close of the gentleman from South Carolina, (Mr. THOMPSON,) who had withdrawn his motion for the previous question in consequence of expressions dropped in the heat of debate susceptible of a construction somewhat insulting to gentlemen representing some of the Northern and Eastern States. In regard to those gentlemen, for himself he would say that he did not now, and he hoped never to, entertain the least disposition to trespass wantonly upon their feelings or to excite unnecessarily their sensibilities. He met them here as equals, and desired ever to be as tender and courteous towards them as he had always found them disposed towards himself.

In conclusion, Mr. C. moved the previous question upon the amendment of the rules offered by Mr. THOMPSON, of South Carolina: but the motion not being seconded, and the question again recurring on the amendment—

Mr. GENTRY said: This is a question of great importance, and one of peculiar delicacy for gentlemen who represent slave-holding constituents to vote upon without explanation, especially when they intend to give a vote against the policy which this House has heretofore deemed it most expedient to pursue in regard to petitions for the abolition of slavery. But, entertaining opinions on this subject different from those of some gentlemen who represent constituents with interests identical with the interests of those whom I have the honor to represent, and having determined, as I always do, to act out the convictions of my own judgment without regard to personal considerations, I desire to avail myself of the courtesy of the House whilst I briefly state the considerations which will control my vote on this question, and express my opinion as to the policy which I believe is demanded by the best interests of the whole country—the South and the North—on this delicate and very important subject. And, for myself, [continued Mr. G.,] I totally repudiate the idea that this is a question which belongs exclusively to the South, or which threatens to bring ruin and destruction only upon Southern interests and Southern institutions. It is a question which involves in its consequences the integrity of the Union and the preservation of the public liberty. The South and the North, the East and the West, are alike interested in the preservation of the Union; and, whilst it is true that the continued agitation of this subject threatens to bring the most fatal calamities upon the South, it is also quite certain that these calamities cannot be visited upon the South without involving the North in the same general vortex of ruin and disaster—for I hold it to be incontrovertibly true that the interests of the South and the North are indissolubly connected, "for weal or for wo," and you cannot bring ruin and destruction on the one section, without ruinously affecting the other. Mr. Speaker, this being the high and important character of the question under consideration—a question involving, as it does, the interests of the South and North—the preservation of the Union, and of the public liberty—it ought, above all others, to be looked at with the calm eye of reason, uninfluenced by our passions, our prejudices, or resentments, to the end that we may take such wise and prudent action in regard to it as will allay excitement in the North and the South, and prevent those disasters which a continued agitation of this subject must, inevitably, bring upon our common country.

Mr. Speaker, I concur with the gentleman from New York (Mr. MONROE) who remarked that the battle of abolition must be fought by the North. Yes, sir, the only reliance of the South for a peaceful and harmless settlement of this question is upon the exertions of the patriotic portion of the North, who take a just view of this subject, and who desire no improper interference with the domestic institutions of the South. When the North shall be united against us on this question, (if that day shall ever come,) they will be able to outvote us here; and we shall then have no alternative left us but to stand to our arms, and maintain our rights at the point of the bayonet. And, I repeat it, Mr. Speaker, it is idle to hope for a peaceable and harmless settlement of this question, unless that object can be achieved by the exertions of those patriotic citizens of the North who are with the South on this subject. And this being the case, I hold it to be highly inexpedient to place this question in such an attitude here as will deprive us of the co-operation of that portion of the Representatives of the North who are with us on the main question. The resolution of the gentleman proposes the non-reception of petitions praying for the abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia and in the Territories of the United States; and we know that the whole People of the North look upon this as a violation of the right of petition as secured to the people by the Constitution. And when we ask our friends of the North, who are with us upon the main question, to act with us in supporting this resolution, we ask them to trample into the dust a right which they believe is secured by the Constitution that they have sworn to support, and to do an act which effects nothing towards the settlement of the question at issue; and which, by throwing them against the current of public opinion at home, destroys their weight of character, and deprives them of that influence which, under a different state of things, could be and would be most usefully exerted to bring their constituents to a just sense of their obligations to their brethren of the South. And, thus whilst we place our friends of the North, who, from motives of patriotism, are willing to co-operate with us in putting down that diabolical spirit which threatens so much of evil to our common country, in a position which destroys them, without accomplishing any thing for us, we at the same time place in the hands of the abolitionists an engine with which they are enabled to operate far more effectually than they could otherwise do. And, Mr. Speaker, if I desired to favor the infamous schemes of the abolitionists of the North, and of unprincipled politicians of the North and South—who desire to fan the excitement in both sections of the Union, with a view of making that excitement subserve their mean ambition—I do not believe that I could more effectually accomplish that desire than by voting for the resolution offered by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. THOMPSON.) I implore gentlemen not to persevere in the course which has heretofore been pursued in regard to abolition petitions, for you thereby enable those deluded fanatics to blend with abolition the right of petition, and enable them to address the sympathies and obtain the support and countenance of thousands, who under other circumstances, would hold them in detestation and abhorrence. The best and most patriotic citizens of the North—those who sympathize with the South on this question—believe that the constitutional right of petition is violated by the course which is contemplated by the resolution; they are unwilling to see that right impaired; they feel bound by high considerations of duty to maintain it. Let us then, Mr. Speaker, place this matter in such a shape as will enable that portion of the Representatives of the North who are with us on the main question, to give us their co-operation, and at the same time not destroy themselves.

Sir, it becomes the Representatives of the South on this floor to look at this question practically—sensibly—uninfluenced by passion or resentment. We must meet this issue sooner or later. When will there come a better time than now! Shall we wait until abolition shall have gathered more strength? Better it is that we meet it now in all its shapes and aspects. Let the subject be fully debated. Let the patriotism of the North represented on this floor speak out. If you are for us on this vital question, speak out and quiet the apprehensions of the South. If you are against us, speak out, and let us prepare for the issue. Let us meet these petitioners as the Sunday mail petitioners were met. Let us receive and refer their petitions to a select committee, with instructions to report that the prayer of the petitioners ought not to be granted, and the reasons in full *why* they ought not to be granted. If the House shall adopt this course will it not be as effectual in allaying the excitement on the subject of abolition as it was in quieting the excitement in regard to the Sunday mails? I believe that, if the House will adopt and steadily persevere in this course, abolition will be deprived of the aliment on which it lives, and will speedily die a natural death, "unwept, unhonored, and unsung." Thus believing, Mr. Speaker, I desire the adoption of a resolution like that proposed by the gentleman from Louisiana who comes from a State as deeply interested in this question as any in the Union, and he has probably a deeper personal interest involved in its proper settlement than any gentleman on this floor, being as I am informed, the owner of very many slaves. No one can suspect him of recreancy to Southern interests on this most vital subject. Let us no longer take counsel from our passions, our prejudices, or our petulance of temper, but let us rather resort to the weapons of reason and argument.—With these, and with the aid of the virtuous and patriotic of the North, we shall be able to put down this fell spirit which disturbs our repose and threatens to destroy the Union. If we fail, what then? I will not permit myself to contemplate the last final alternative. But I maintain that it is our true policy to meet this issue now. No advantage can be gained by staying it off. Let us know what this thing is, in all its proportions, shapes, and aspects. We cannot remove the [illegible] that are thickening around us by shrinking from them. We must meet them manfully, fearlessly, but calmly and temperately. Let the North speak out on this floor. Let us know what you intend to do, gentlemen. Let us have a report from a committee, telling the abolitionists that their petitions cannot and ought not to be granted. Let us see if gentlemen from the North will unite

(Continued on Fourth Page.)

(Concluded from Fourth Page.)

Mr. HUNT, of New York, being entitled to the floor—

Mr. COOPER, of Pennsylvania, rose and appealed to Mr. H. to yield the floor, to enable him to offer a resolution which he had some days since attempted to introduce in relation to the transportation of the mails.

Mr. REED made a similar appeal with a view to have referred a certain bill from the Senate.

Mr. SERGEANT also made a similar appeal, to enable him to make a report from the Committee on the Judiciary, (the nature of which was such, Mr. S. said he was sure no objection would be made to its reception at this time if the House would hear what it was.)

Mr. HUNT expressed himself willing, in return for the courtesy which the House had extended to him last evening in adjourning somewhat before the usual hour, to yield the floor for the introduction of any proposition that would not create debate, or deprive him of the opportunity he had long sought of expressing his sentiments on the all-absorbing topic before the House. Under any other conditions, he could not yield.

But numerous objections were made to the introduction of any of the matters above referred to, and the call of proceed! proceed!" was very general.

Thereupon Mr. HUNT commenced his remarks, and continued to address the House with great animation till past three o'clock—

When after an earnest struggle for the floor (in which Mr. HABERSHAM, of Georgia, stated that he had been endeavoring for two months to obtain it, and had never yet been able to succeed) it was awarded by the Chair [then occupied by Mr. BRIGGS] to

Mr. BYNUM, of North Carolina, who commenced an earnest speech in support of Mr. THOMPSON's resolution, and had proceeded till 4 o'clock, when he gave way for a motion made by Mr. Turney to adjourn.

Mr. BLACK, of Georgia, entreated Mr. TURNEY to suspend the motion long enough for him to move a resolution that the Clerk be empowered to get the printing of the House done under the resolution of 1819, until further ordered by the House.

Mr. WILLIAMS, of N. C., objected to the introduction of the resolution.

Mr. BLACK [amid much confusion and loud cries of order] was understood to say that he had been induced to offer the resolution that he might bring himself as near to the position occupied by his colleague, now absent, as circumstances would permit. He was going on to say that certain members of the Georgia Delegation had been denounced in advance by a certain Southern paper—

When he was called to order, by the Chair, and by voices from all quarters of the House and, after some further efforts to address the House, he reluctantly took his seat.

Mr. HOFFMAN wished the motion for adjournment suspended that he might move a further extension of the Rules of Order. He stated that otherwise, the former resolution expiring to-night, the House would to-morrow be altogether without rules.

Mr. BLACK again rose and said that, by the assent of the gentleman from N. C., (Mr. BYNUM,) he would move to suspend the rules, in order that he might introduce his resolution in regard to printing.

Mr. LEWIS WILLIAMS again objected; the gentleman from Georgia had no right to make such a motion; either the gentleman from N. Carolina must proceed, or the motion on adjournment must be put.

Mr. BYNUM said he would yield the floor for the motion to suspend, on the understanding that he should be entitled to it to-morrow.

[Cries of "No, no; no understand."]

Mr. TURNEY then renewed his motion to adjourn.

Mr. HOFFMAN again reminded the House that it would be without any Rules of Order unless his motion to extend the time in the former resolution should be received; and he renewed the motion that the former rules be continued in force for ten days longer.

Mr. BLACK objecting—

The question was put on adjournment.

Mr. STANLY demanded the yeas and nays; which were ordered and resulted as follows: Yeas 98. nays 52.

So the motion prevailed, and the House adjourned.

[The House will, of course, to-morrow be without any Rules of Order, other than such as may rest on the general principles of parliamentary law.]

Friday, January 24th.

Mr. Hoffman, by permission of Mr. BYNUM, [who had the floor from yesterday,] moved that the rules of the House adopted at the last Congress, (and the temporary adoption of which by this House expired last evening, he continued until the further order of the House.

Mr. BYNUM signified his assent.

Mr. HAND wished to introduce an amendment excepting certain rules in relation to the previous question. His amendment was read for information.

Mr. HOFFMAN, claiming the floor, moved the previous question upon the motion.

Mr. HAND contended that, as no rules were now in force, the previous question could not be enforced.

The CHAIR decided that, although the resolution continuing the rules had expired, yet the previous question, as established by parliamentary law, still existed, and therefore the motion of Mr. Hoffman was in order.

The previous question was thereupon seconded, put, and carried, and the main question on Mr. HOFFMAN's motion was agreed to without a division.

So the rules of the preceding Congress were adopted, and continued as the rules of this House until otherwise ordered.

Mr. HAND applied for the yeas and nays; but the Chair decided that his application was too late, the decision of the House having been announced before it was made.

Mr. BOTTS then rose and observed that it had been the custom of the House for gentlemen to notice here newspaper statements. In conformity with precedents on that subject, he begged to read to the House a letter which had been placed in his hands as having been written by a Reporter in House for the Charleston Courier.

He then read the letter as follows:

"In the House, Mr. Botts attempted to get up another pistol affair, in consequence of remarks made yesterday by Mr. Smith, of Maine. Mr. B., in his speech of Thursday, was very liberal of his abuse on Andrew Jackson—called him a tyrant, impostor, and of course every thing vile and villainous. Mr. Smith, in his reply yesterday, stated that history would give the lie to the opprobrium which had been heaped upon the hero of New Orleans, and that his memory would live when his abusers and their abuse should be forgotten, &c. To the remark about history Mr. Botts took exception, and expressed a great deal of uneasiness to know whether it was used in a *personal* sense; and intimated that if it was so intended, daggers, pistols, bowie knives would be the consequence. To this threat Mr. Smith, (who by the way is a jolly, good-humored wag, and the largest man in the House, save Mr. Lewis,) replied that he meant, as usual, all that he said, and that if gentlemen lacked a *quantum sufficit* of that scarce commodity, common sense, to understand words, he really could not at this time waste the money of the People by giving the chivalrous member from Virginia an opportunity of exterminating him, or *vice versa*. With this explanation Mr. Botts seemed satisfied, and said a few words about 'whatsoever' insult was intended not being appliable to him, &c., and took his seat, much mortified at the laughter with which the conclusion of this tragic farce was received by the audience."

Mr. B. said he had no motion to make, but he submitted to the Speaker and to every gentleman on the floor whether they did not all recognise the statement read as a base fabrication throughout—a falsehood from beginning to end.—And he further submitted whether it did not become the dignity of the House that its courtesy in affording seats in the Hall to persons in the character of reporters should not be prostituted by the admission of blackguards as letter-writers.

Mr. PETRIKIN gave notice that he should ask leave to introduce a bill for the reduction of duties on the importation of rail-road iron.

Mr. KEIM presented a petition from CHARLES J. INGERSOLL contesting the seat of CHARLES NAYLOR a member of this House, and asked that it be read by the Clerk.

Objection being made—

Mr. KEIM claimed it as a right, on the ground of privilege.

Mr. RAMSEY supported the motion; and, the House assenting, the memorial was read, and referred to the Committee of Elections.

Mr. CAMPBELL, from the Committee of Elections, asked and obtained leave for that committee to sit during the sittings of the House.

Mr. RAMSY asked leave to present a memorial from certain citizens of the Third Congressional District of Pennsylvania, to the same end as the memorial of Mr. INGERSOLL, above referred to; but objection was made and leave refused at this time.

Mr. SERGEANT, of Pennsylvania, from the Committee on the Judiciary, asked leave to report a bill to amend the bill directing the taking of the census.

Objection was at first made, but Mr. S. moving to suspend the rules to allow him to report the bill; and

Mr. LAWRENCE, of Massachusett, remonstrating and adverting to the importance of the bill and the President's anxiety that as little delay as possible should take place in the passage of so necessary a bill, the objection was withdrawn; and thereupon

Mr. SERGEANT reported a bill to amend the bill directing and providing for the taking of the sixth census of the people of the United States.

The bill was twice read and referred to a Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union.

Mr. DAVIS, of Kentucky, from the select committee on the boundary between Missouri and Iowa, stated that that committee was ready to report. He referred to the excitement which had existed on the borders of those two portions of the Union, the course recently pursued by the Governor of Missouri, and the hope of the committee that this report would be effectual for allaying the existing excitement.

Mr. HUBBARD, of Alabama, objected. He said that the House was already in the midst of a war of the abolitionists against the slave holding States; let this first be settled [illegible] it looked after the war between Missouri and Iowa.

Mr. BYNUM thereupon resumed the floor. In the course of Mr. B's. remarks a personal reference to another member gave rise to some altercation and some excitement. Some incidental proceedings were had thereon, which resulted in leave to Mr. B. to proceed, and then the House adjourned.

COMMUNICATIONS.

For the Philanthropist.

ILLINOIS.

Farmington, Fulton co., Ill., Jan. 3, 1840.

DR. BAILEY:

Dear Sir,—I send you herewith, in accordance with a vote of that body, the proceedings of one of the most interesting conventions that I have ever had the pleasure of attending in the State—interesting for the numbers in attendance, for the delightful christian spirit that marked all their deliberations, for the expanded views of duty, and the perfect unanimity with which every proposition was received and resolutions passed.

Agreeably to appointment, an Anti-Slavery Convention assembled at Canton on Dec. 4th, 1839.

Rev. John Waters was chosen President, and Jeremiah Porter, Secretary.

Convention was opened by a series of prayers offered to the throne of grace by Messrs. Miter and Gale.

Delegates Present.—From Galesburg, Knox co., Rev. John Waters, Rev. G. W. Gale, Rev. Horatio Foot, Messrs. Nehemiah West, John Kendall, Eli Farnam, Levi Spencer and Adam Haynor. From Knoxville, Rev. J. J. Miter, Messrs. Samuel Metcalf, Thomas C. Moore and Michael Metcalf. From Genesee, Henry co., Dr. Enos Pomeroy and Samuel Bacon. From Mission Institute, No. 4, Adams co., Messrs. Orville Jones, James E. Burr, W. W. Williams and H. Griffin. From Mission Institute, No. 3, T. O. Jones. From Quincy, Adams co., Willard Keys. From Ottawa, Lasalle co., Rev. Chauncey Cook. From Juliet, Will co., Rev. Hiram Foot and Dr. J. S. C. Adams. From Granville, Putnam co., Rev. H. G. Pendleton, Union Grove, Rev. J. A. Dickey and Samuel G. Laughlin. From Washington, Tazewell co., Rev. R. Barnes and J. Randolph Scott. From Canton, Fulton co., Rev. Robert Stewart, Messrs. Loring Ames, Nathan Jones, John Whitten, Geo. W. Gould, Charles Kirkpatrick, D. C. Jones, F. B. Offield, William Wright and Oliver Davey. From Harkness, Peoria co., Rev. Robert Miller, Messrs. Eli Wilson, David Wright and A. Orton.

Messrs. Dickey, Barues, Gale, Cook, West, Wilson and Laughlin were appointed a Business Committee. After a friendly discussion and inquiry in regard to duty, it was resolved to look to God in prayer for guidance, in accordance with which, Messrs. Cook, Waters and Porter led successively in prayer.

Took a recess until one o'clock.

Met at 1 o'clock. The following resolutions reported by the Business Committee, after a free and full discussion of each, were adopted without a dissenting voice.

With Regard to a Press and Libraries.

In view of the present pecuniary embarrassments of the country,

Resolved, That this Convention consider it inexpedient at this time to establish an Anti-Slavery paper in the State, and therefore approve of the resolution of the State Society adopting the Philanthropist as its organ, and recommend that the friends of the cause make special effort to give it a general circulation throughout the State.

Resolved, That we recommend to the Executive Committee to take measures for the establishment of Anti-Slavery libraries, and the circulation of Anti-Slavery publications throughout the State.

Resolutions on Political Action.

1. That we regard the elective franchise as a boon of inestimable worth from the great Author of every good and perfect gift, designed for the preservation of those civil and religious liberties which He has so graciously bestowed upon our land; and those who do not use it for that intent, and those who do not use it at all, as false to the solemn trust committed to them.

2. That those who give their votes to elevate men to office, who in theory or practice contradict the Declaration of our fathers, that God has endowed all men with the inalienable rights of liberty, are taking the most direct measures to destroy our free institutions.

3. That we consider the man who gives his suffrage to men who will vote away the liberty of the land in the halls of legislation, as no less guilty than they.

4. That, whoever advocates or apologizes for the bondage of the black man, is an unsafe depository for the liberties of the white man; he is too ignorant of the doctrine of human rights, or too corrupt to jeopard his interest or his popularity, to maintain them.

5. That we have no confidence in the two prominent candidates for filling the highest office in the gift of our nation; while one is pledged to gratify the wishes of the slaveholder, the other openly advocates as well as practices that anti-republican, anti-christian system.

6. That while we are adverse to the organization of an anti-slavery party, for the purpose of political action, we believe it to be the duty of all friendly to the cause of abolition, to cast their votes only for such as are friendly to the cause, especially for those who fill the executive or legislative offices of Government.

7. That the legislators of this state at their last session greatly dishonored the State and themselves, by grouping men with cattle, and making them equally the subjects of taxation; thereby sanctioning the horrible system of slavery, which aims at annihilating that eternal distinction which God has made between the man and the brute.

8. That, while slavery is tolerated by law, our State the hunting ground of the slaveholder and kidnapper, our civil officers slave-catchers, and our jails made the depositories of their prey, we are not worthy to be denominated a free State.

9. That it is the duty of every citizen to send in petitions to the General Assembly of this State, to repeal those laws which oppress the colored man, and to enact others which will secure the right of trial by jury to every man claimed as property, and remove all distinction among our citizens on the ground of color.

The Rev. John Cross, agent of the American Anti-Slavery Society for this State, having been introduced to the Convention, by invitation took his seat as a member. In connection with which the following resolutions were unanimously adopted.

1. That we view with joy and devout thanksgiving the appearance of the Rev. John Cross among us as the Agent of the A. A S. S. for this State, and we pledge him our prayers and co-operation and support.

2. That the order of the day for nine o'clock A. M. to-morrow, be to listen to statements from Mr. Cross.

Adjourned to meet to-morrow morning at half past 8 o'clock.

Thursday Morning.—Met according to adjournment. Meeting opened with a season of prayer, being led in devotion by Messrs. Waters, Cook and Pendleton.

Proceeded to the order of the day and listened with deep interest for about two hours to statements from Mr. Cross.

The Business Committee then reported the following resolutions, which passed after discussion with perfect unanimity.

1. That the system of Slavery which prevails in these United States, endangers not only the civil liberties of the nation, but also is the chief obstacle to the prevalence of the gospel at home and abroad.

2. That the Bible, properly interpreted, so far from sustaining the System of American Slavery, is the most powerful weapon that can be used to destroy it.

3. That the guilt of American Slavery rests chiefly upon the Church, and especially upon the ministry.

4. That the fundamental principles of Abolition are identical with those of the Christian religion, both resting upon the great law of love.

5. That the posture assumed by a large portion of the American Church, in propping up the corrupt and anti-christian system, is deeply humiliating to every Christian of right views, and who feels concerned for the honor and influence of that Church, either in this country or abroad.

6. That the time is not distant when ministers of the gospel must take a decided stand on the side of the oppressed, or forfeit the confidence of every community.

7. That we cordially approve the course of those ministers and churches who refuse the hand of fellowship to such as commit the sin of slaveholding, or give countenance to the crime.

8. That the principle of love as inculcated in the gospel, extends to all human relations without any restriction, and that the Christian is a debtor to *all men alike*, without respect to condition, color, or any other accidental distinction.

9. That there is no other principle which is adapted to regenerate the world, or to bring about a harmonious and perfect state of the social system, and that wherever there is any infraction of this feature of the gospel, *in relation to any human being*, its high sanctions are invaded, and its reforming power impaired. And, therefore,

10. That any system which is founded on a palpable violation of this great law of Heaven, is anti-christian in its whole structure, and in all its tendencies is at war with the purifying influences of religion.

11. That the system of American Slavery in its nature and in all its bearings, is such a violation of the letter and spirit of this law of love, being antagonist to all the principles of natural and revealed religion: and, therefore,

12. That it is a crime against nature, a practical and *most palpable "heresy,"* and a slander upon the religion of Jesus Christ, and wherever upheld or apologized for, or shielded from the united condemnation of the church, tends directly to corruption and infidelity.

A letter was read from Rev. Lucien Farnam of Hadley, Will co., apologizing in behalf of the A. S. S. of that place, for not being represented in Convention, and expressing their unabated interest in the cause of the slave. Messrs. Dickey and Cross were appointed to deliver public addresses in the afternoon.

Closed with prayer by Mr. Dickey.

Had a recess until half past one o'clock.

Thursday Afternoon.—Services were opened with prayer and singing, the throne of grace being addressed by Messrs. Waters and Stewart.

Mr. Dickey showed in his address, conclusively, to a deeply interested audience, that neither the Old Testament, nor the New sanctions the system of American Slavery.

Mr. Cross in a thrilling manner corroborated the same, answered objections and showed how intimately the Anti-Slavery cause is connected with revivals of religion—presenting the fact that few revivals of religion had occurred for several years past, except in those churches which had heartily espoused the cause of the slave.

Closed with singing and prayer.

Adjourned to meet at half past six o'clock.

Evening.—Met according to adjournment. After deliberation,

Resolved, That a Convention similar to the present, be held at Juliet, Will co., on the third Thursday of February next, to be opened at six o'clock, P. M., and that Messrs. Foot, Cross and Cook be a Committee to notify and make arrangements for the same.

Farther *Resolved*,

1. That, in view of the past, the friends of Emancipation in this country are called upon to render devout thanksgiving to God for the success which He has hitherto given to our cause, and therefore they should prosecute their work with increasing hopes of success.

2. That those who judge of the success of our cause from apparent numbers, "reckon without their host," since the friend of freedom depends upon truth as his great engine, and the moral worth of the nation as his strength.

3. That the unanimity with which the business of this Convention has been transacted and the christian spirit which has characterized the whole session, is a delightful feature in the Anti-Slavery enterprise in this State.

Resolved, That the Secretary forward the proceedings of this Convention, for publication, to the Western Telegraph, Canton, the Peoria Register and the Philanthropist.

Closed with prayer by Mr. Miter.—Adjourned.

(Signed) JOHN WATERS, *Pres.*
JEREMIAH PORTER, *Sec.*

For the Philanthropist.

NEWPORT ANTI SLAVERY SOCIETY.

The citizens of Newport, Wayne county, Indiana, and its vicinity, were called together yesterday, 1st mo. 17th, 1840, to consider the propriety of forming an Anti-Slavery Society in this village.

A respectable number assembled; after attentively listening to two very interesting discourses on the subject, delivered by Lewis Hicklin and Arnold Buffum, the constitution was offered for signers, and received about eighty, when the meeting adjourned to 6 o'clock at night, when it was attended by a much larger number of citizens than the former, when the meeting proceeded to appoint the following officers, to wit:

Jonathan Unthank, *President.*
Andrew Meredith, Esq., *Vice President.*
Henry H. Way, *Recording Secretary.*
Griffin Davis, *Corresponding do.*
John Fisher, *Treasurer.*
David Willcuts, Nathan Thomas, William Way, Levi Coffin, James Lovin, Mikol Keever, Robert Green, and Josiah Bell, *Managers.*

The constitution being again read and offered for signers, received about the number that was obtained at the meeting in the forenoon—making in the whole one hundred and sixty-two members. The following resolutions were then offered, and freely discussed, and unanimously passed.

Resolved, That the signs of the times clearly indicate that the good spirit of God is moving upon the hearts of the people, and preparing them to listen and receive the truth in relation to this righteous cause.

Resolved, That we return our thanks to our friends Arnold Buffum and Lewis Hicklin, for their untiring and unflinching services in the anti-slavery cause in our neighborhood, and recommend them to the kind attention and sympathy of our fellow-citizens wherever they may come.

Resolved, That the proceedings of this meeting be forwarded to the Editors of the Richmond Palladium, the Jeffersonian, the National Patriot and Philanthropist, for publication in their respective papers.

P. S. This Society is auxiliary to the State Anti-Slavery Society. The Constitution the same as the other A. S. Constitutions.

JONATHAN UNTHANK, Pres.
ANDREW MEREDITH, Vice Pres.
HENRY H. WAY, Rec. Sec.
GRIFFIN DAVIS, Cor. Sec.

For the Philanthropist.

INDIANA—POLITICAL ACTION.

Jefferson Co., Ia., Jan. 6th, 1840.

DR. BAILEY:

Dear Sir—At a meeting of the Niels Creek A. S. S. on the 14th ult., there were several resolutions offered and discussed at considerable length and unanimously adopted, the principal of which was, on political action. At the close of the meeting, but before adjournment, Mr. Higgins moved that the resolutions, as adopted, be forwarded to the Philanthropist for publication; whereupon Mr. L. Hoyt gave notice that he intended to offer some important resolutions at the next meeting, which would be the anniversary of the society, and it was therefore, thought best to postpone the forwarding of the adopted resolutions till after that meeting. On the 4th inst., the society convened agreeably to adjournment, at 10 o'clock A. M. Dr. Bennett was present, and delivered an able and interesting address on the oft repeated question, "what have the free states to do with slavery."—The facts adduced upon this subject, were truly astounding. It was the first time the subject had been laid before the society, and the almost breathless silence that prevailed during the address, which occupied almost two hours, was sufficient evidence of the deep interest felt by all present.—At the conclusion of the address, the society proceeded to the transaction of business; the principal of which was, the election of officers for the ensuing year. The following is the result of the election, viz., Daniel H. Nelson, president, E. H. Higgins, Vice president, B. Hoyt, Secretary, E. T. Tibbets, Treasurer, J. Nelson, Librarian, and A. Walton jr., L. Wells, and L. Hoyt, Directors. The day being too far spent for the transaction of other business, the society adjourned to early candle light same evening. At 6 o'clock the society met pursuant to adjournment, and after being called to order by the president, Mr. Hoyt introduced his resolutions, which, together with the Declaration, were ably discussed till after nine o'clock, to the great entertainment, (we believe) of a large audience, and to the establishing of the wavering, and strengthening of the confidence of all, in the justice and ultimate success of the abolition cause. It will be proper to give you the resolutions passed on the 14th ult. before Mr. Hoyt's, which were as follows:

1. *Resolved*, That we view with mournful and sincere regret, the attempt made at the late special meeting of the American A. S. S., at Cleveland Ohio, to organize a distinct A. S. political party, believing as we do, that such a party would be injurious if not fatal, to the cause in which abolitionists are engaged.

2. *Resolved*, That we will endeavor to supply ourselves with groceries and such other articles as we need for domestic use, as far as possible, from the produce of free labor.

The following are the resolutions and declarations offered by Mr. Hoyt.

3. *Resolved*, That the laws enacted by Congress and the slave states to *protect* and *support* the institution of slavery, are in direct contravention of the principles on which the government of this union is founded; and that they are opposed to, and subversive of our noblest and most sacred republican institutions, and the laws of our all wise and Benificent Creator.

4. *Resolved*, That the laws now in existence in the U. S., for the support of slavery, are unequal in their bearings upon the several states of this Union—more unjust and oppressive upon the people of the free states, than those which the British parliament attempted to force upon the American colonies, previous to the Revolution. To prove this, let facts be submitted to a candid public.

The slave states have an undue influence in the National councils, and in the election of President and Vice President, they being entitled by law, to *twenty-four* more Representatives in Congress, and twenty-four more votes in proportion to their free white inhabitants, than the free states, and these Representatives are paid their salaries out of the public treasury; thus subjecting the free states to an expense, for which they receive no equivalent, and which amounts to but little less than taxation without representation. Congress has passed laws, or resolutions (at slavery's bidding) in open violation of the people's rights viz., the freedom of speech, the freedom of the press and the right of petition. It has waged unjust and cruel war against some of the Indian tribes within our borders, who, if unmolested, would have been peaceable and unoffending. The Florida war especially, has robbed our country of many of its most valuable citizens, and cost the people nearly *twenty millions* of dollar, and of all this, slavery has been the procuring cause. Congress has also passed laws distributing large sums of money to the slave states which of right belonged to the free states. The legislatures of the slave states have passed laws excluding the free people of color from the privileges of moral, religious and literary institutions. They have also passed laws forcing the free people of color into the free states; thus subjecting the people of the free states to the expense of educating them, or to the burden of sustaining a portion of their population in ignorance and consequent degradation, which is contrary to the spirit and genius of our free institutions opposed and dangerous to their prosperity and efficiency.

Notwithstanding the constitution expressly declares that "the citizens of each state shall be entitled to all the privileges and immunities of citizens of the several states," and that "the right of the people to be secured in their persons, houses, papers and effects, shall not *be violated*," and that "no person shall be deprived of life, liberty or property, without due process of law;" the citizens of the free states have been arrested while travelling in the slave states, and that too, without any process of law, and by a mob tribunal been condemned to the most ignominious punishment—robbed of their papers, trunks, and even of the clothes upon their backs; shamefully and barbarously scourged, and then driven away destitute and almost naked, not because they had violated any law, but because they were *suspected* of being unfriendly to their "peculiar domestic institution".

Such are the laws in some of the slave states, that a citizen of the north or free states is in danger, if he chance to go there, of being deprived of life, liberty and property. Outrages of this kind upon the free citizens of the north, have not been unfrequent.

The authorities of the slave states have, by false pretences, procured the citizens of the free states to be trasported into other states, to be tried for crimes of which they were entirely innocent, and of which their accusers, with all their machinations with a prejudiced court and jury, were not able to convict them; thus trampling beneath their unhallowed feet a most sacred provision of the constitution, by depriving them of a trial in the state and district where the crime was alleged to have been committed, a privilege which the constitution expressly guarantees to every citizen.

They have kidnapped and carried off citizens of the free states, to whose services they had not the least shadow of claim, and consigned them to the most cruel and degrading slavery. They have converted the elective franchise into an engine of corruption, (that institution, which, of all others in a republican government, should be kept pure) holding out the honors and emoluments of office, to induce citizens to lend their influence for the support, strengthening and extension of the institution of slavery.

5. Therefore, *Resolved*, That it is our duty, as christians, philanthropists, republican and patriots, to use all lawful means in our power, to put an end to slavery in these United States, and throughout the world.

And we do hereby declare, that we are prompted to this resolution by the knowledge of the foregoing facts, by the love we owe to God, to mankind and to our common country; by the gratitude we owe to our revolutionary ancestors for transmitting to us at the expense of so much blood and treasure, our religious and political liberty! By the obligations we are under to transmit to posterity, those inestimable blessings, and in short, by every principle and every thing we hold dear and sacred!

At the close of the discussion, which was perfectly amicable, a resolution was adopted at the request of Doct. Bennett, authorizing the publication of the foregoing resolutions and declarations in the Philanthropist. As my sheet is not quite full, I will just observe, that the march of abolition in this quarter, is onward, and we receive new accession at nearly every meeting. In a neighborhood six or 8 miles from this place, there have been several meetings held within a few months, with good effect. At the first meeting the house was assailed with stones and brick bats, dreadful things were threatened against those who should lecture there in future, and those who might assemble to hear &c. &c. But the friends of the cause there, and some of the most respectable, influential class of citizens, took a firm stand against these mobocratic movements, and have looked them into silence. At Smyrna meeting house, and at Bro. Becks about 6 miles from Madison, Doct. Bennett, L. Hicklin and Mr. Henderson, have lectured with good success. Many firm and zealous abolitionists are to be found in those places, whose ears are open to the cries of the down-trodden, and whose sympathies are excited for their welfare. Societies will soon (we trust) be formed amongst them.

Yours for the slave.
B. HOYT. *Sec'ry.*

THE PHILANTHROPIST.

EDITED BY G. BAILEY, JR.

CINCINNATI:

Tuesday Morning, February 4, 1840.

GENERAL HARRISON—THE ABOLITIONISTS.

The last presidential canvass occupied only a small share of the attention of anti-slavery editors. Mr. Van Buren was severely censured for his subserviency to the South, but the political duties of abolitionists in reference to the rival candidates were scarcely noticed. Abolition-sentiment was too feeble, to be admitted by politicians as an element in their calculations: both parties were eager to demonstrate their devotion to the slaveholding interest.

Times have changed. Abolitionism now, to a considerable extent, commands respect from politicians. One party at least, in the North, manifests less zeal in proving to the slaveholder its soundness on the slavery-question; and, whatever hostility it may feel, as a body, against anti-slavery sentiments, cannot afford to excommunicate its anti-slavery members. The subject of the political duties of abolitionists is an engrossing topic in the leading anti-slavery papers. The question of slavery is mixed up with the question of the presidency, and throughout the country, in public estimation, it is becoming as important to know a candidate's sentiments on the subject of slavery, as on that of banks or the tariff.

These changes which have occurred within a period of little more than three years, would furnish useful lessons to the slaveholder and his northern supporter, would they but *consider*.

There is much to interest an anti-slavery man in some of the aspects of the present canvass for the presidency. The leaders of the democratic party in the free states, with a view to political capital in the South, are striving to fasten on General Harrison the charge of abolitionism. Their leading papers in the West labor as earnestly to prove him an enemy to slavery, and a friend of the principles of the Revolution, as if to be such, were enough to blast his character in the eyes of the American people, and disqualify him for office. Of course, they proceed on the assumption, that their favorite candidate is a friend of slavery, and an enemy to the doctrines which the fathers of the revolution consecrated with their blood. To the credit of the opposition papers in the West, be it spoken; in this instance, it must be confessed, they have shown some generous feeling. Content that their opponents should bear off the palm of pro-slavery servility, they have betrayed little disposition to vindicate their candidate against such accusations. In the slave-states the case is different—the whig press toiling as hard to prove General Harrison a pro-slavery man, as the administration press strives to brand him with abolitionism.

The views of anti-slavery editors regarding the Harrisburg nomination should be known by our readers. They all, we believe, recognize the fact, that the rejection of Mr. Clay, and selection of General Harrison as the candidate of the opposition party, are, to some extent, a concession to the spirit of liberty in the North. The Liberator and Christian Witness have not yet expressed any opinion as to the effect such a concession ought to have on the votes of abolitionists. The Friend of Man and Pa. Freeman, having recapitulated the acts of Gen. Harrison on the slavery question, insist that nothing less than a public expression of a change of sentiment on his part, can entitle him to abolition votes. The Massachusetts Abolitionist takes the same ground, but advocates it more strenuously; while the Emancipator goes still further, and arrays itself in unceasing hostility against the nomination. The conductors of these prints are all, no doubt, mainly concerned for the integrity of abolitionists; but the editors of the two last named papers are influenced in addition, we presume, by their strong bias in favor of a third political party. Having adopted the theory, that the existing parties are incurably corrupt, and that abolitionism has nothing more to hope from their action, the tendency in their minds must be to view every act of either party in its worst light. To this tendency we ascribe a portion of their peculiar zeal against the candidate of the opposition.

Hitherto, we have not seen in any paper, anti-slavery or political, a fair and full statement of General Harrison's course with regard to slavery and abolition. The anti-slavery press of the North and the whig press of the South have carefully furnished all the facts that can go to show his devotion to slavery. The democratic press in both sections of the Union publishes a different class of facts. The whig press in the free states, fairly puzzled, makes out to say, almost nothing.

This is greatly to be regretted. We see not how a right decision can be made, in the absence of correct information. Abolitionists particularly ought to possess themselves of *all* the facts on the subject, and then decide for themselves, independently, how they ought to act. To aid our readers in this matter, we shall lay before them all the information we have been able to gather.

1. The following is an extract from a speech delivered by General Harrison, at a public dinner, Vincennes, (Ia.,) May 26th, 1835. It is [illegible]ed in some of the anti-slavery papers of the East, and in several Southern papers, as an evidence that he is "sound to the core on the subject of slavery."

Gen. Harrison on Slavery.

I have now, fellow-citizens, a few more wor[illegible] another subject, and which is, in my opinion of [illegible] portance than any other that is now in the course of discussion in any part of the Union. I allude to the [illegible] which have been formed, and the movements of [illegible] dividuals in some of the states in relation to a portion of the population in others. The conduct of these persons [illegible] more dangerous, because their object is masked under the garb of disinterestedness and benevolence; and their course vindicated by arguments and propositions which [illegible] stract no one can deny. But, however fascinating may be the dress with which their schemes are presented [illegible] fellow-citizens, with whatever purity of intention they have been formed and sustained, they will be found [illegible] in their train mischief to the whole Union, and [illegible] a large portion of it, which, it is probable some of the [illegible] jectors and many of their supporters have never [illegible] the latter, the first in the series of evils which are [illegible] from their source, are such as you have seen perpe[illegible] the fair plains of Italy and Gaul, by the Scyth[illegible] Attila and Alaric; and such as most of you [illegible] upon that memorable night, when the tomahawks [illegible] clubs of the followers of Tecumseh were raising [illegible] suburbs. I regard not the disavowals of any such [illegible] upon the part of the authors of these schemes, [illegible] the examination of the publications which have [illegible] they will be found to contain the very facts, and very [illegible] ment which would have used, if such had been their [illegible] I am certain that there is not, in this assembly one [illegible] deluded men, and that there are few within the [illegible] the State. If there are any, I would earnestly entreat [illegible] to forbear; to pause in their career, and deliberate [illegible] er the consequence of their conduct to the whole [illegible] the States more immediately interested, and [illegible] whose benefit they profess to act. That the latter [illegible] the victims of the weak, injudicious, presumptu[illegible] constitutional efforts to serve them, a thorough [illegible] of the subject must convince them. The strug[illegible] struggle there must be) may commence with [illegible] I have described, but it will end with more [illegible] the chains, or in the utter extirpation of those who [illegible] they advocate.

Am I wrong, fellow-citizens, in applying the terms [illegible] presumptuous and unconstitutional, to the measures of the emancipators? A slight examination will I think show that I am not. In a vindication of the objects of a convention which was lately held in one of the towns of Ohio, which I saw in a newspaper, it was said that nothing [illegible] was intended than to produce a state of public feeling which would lead to an amendment of the Constitution, authorizing the abolition of slavery in the United States. Now can an amendment of the Constitution be effected without the consent of the southern States? What then is the proposition to be submitted to them? It is this:—"The present provisions of the Constitution secure to you the right (a right which you held before it was made, which you have never given up,) to manage your domestic concerns in your own way, but as we are convinced that you do not manage them properly, we want you to put in the hands of the General Government, in the councils of which we have the majority, the control over these matters, the effect of which will be virtually to transfer the power from yours into our hands." Again, in some of the States, and in sections of others, the black population far exceeds that of the white. Some of the emancipators propose immediate abolition.—What is the proposition, then, as it regards the States and parts of States, but the alternatives of amalgamation with the blacks, or an exchange of situations with them! Is there any man of common sense who does not believe that the emancipated blacks, being a majority, will not insist upon a full participation of political rights with the whites, and when possessed of these, they will not contend for a full share of social rights also? What but the extremity of weakness and folly could induce any one to think, that such propositions as these could be listened to by a people so intelligent as the southern States? Further. The emancipators generally declare that it is their intention to effect their object (although their acts contradict their assertion) by no other means than by convincing the slave-holders that the emancipation of the slaves is called for, both by moral obligation and sound policy. An unfledged youth, at the moment of his leaving (indeed, in many instance before he has left it,) his Theological Seminary, undertakes to give lectures upon morals to the countrymen of Wythe, Tucker, Pendleton and Lowndes, and lessons of political wisdom to States, whose affairs have so recently been directed by Jefferson and Madison, Macon and Crawford. Is it possible that instances of greater vanity and presumption could be exhibited? But the course pursued by the emancipators is unconstitutional. I do not say that there are any words in the Constitution which forbid the discussions they are engaged in; I know that there are not. And citizens have the right to express and publish their opinions without restriction. But in the construction of the Constitution, it is always necessary to refer to the circumstances under which it was framed and to ascertain its meaning by a comparison of its provisions with each other, and with the previous situation of the several States who were parties to it. In a portion of these, slavery was recognized, and they took care to have the right secured to them; to follow and reclaim such of them as were fugitives to other States. The laws of Congress passed under this power, have provided punishment to any one who shall oppose or interrupt the exercise of this right. Now can any one believe, that the instrument which contains a provision of this kind, which authorizes a master to pursue his slave into another State, take him back, and provides a punishment for any citizen or citizens of that State who should oppose him, should, at the same time, authorize the latter to assemble together, to pass resolutions and adopt Addresses, not only to encourage the slaves to leave their masters, but to cut their throats before they do so?

I insist that if the citizens of the non-slaveholding States can avail themselves of the article of the Constitution which prohibits the restriction of speech or the press to publish any thing injurious to the rights of the slave-holding States, that they can go to the extreme that I have mentioned, and effect any thing further which writing or speaking could effect.—But, fellow-citizens, these are not the principles of the Constitution. Such a construction would defeat one of the great objects of its formation, which was that of securing the peace and harmony of the States which were parties to it. The liberty of speech and of the press, were given as the most effectual means to preserve to each and every citizen their own rights, and to the States the rights which appertained to them, at the time of their adoption. It could never have been expected that it would be used by the citizens of one portion of the States for the purpose of depriving those of another portion, of the rights which they had reserved at the adoption of the Constitution, and in the exercise of which, none but themselves have any concern or interest. If slavery is an evil, the evil is with them. If there is guilt in it, the guilt is theirs, not ours, since neither the States where it not exist, nor the Government of the United States can, without usurpation of power, and the violation of a solemn compact, do anything to remove it without the consent of those who are immediately interested.—But they will neither ask for aid, nor consent to be [illegible] whilst the illegal, persecuting and dangerous movements are in progress, of which I complain; the interest of all concerned requires that these should be stopped immediately.—This can only be done by the force of public opinion, and that cannot too soon be brought into operation. Every movement which is made by the Abolitionists in the non-slaveholding States, is viewed by our southern brethren as an attack upon their rights, and which, if persisted in, must in the end eradicate those feelings of attachment and affection between the citizens of all the States which was produced by a community of interests and dangers in the War of the Revolution, which was the foundation of our happy Union, and by a continuance of which, it can alone be preserved. I entreat you, then, to frown upon the measures which are to produce results so much to be deprecated. The opinions which I have now given, I have omitted no opportunity for the last two years to lay before the people of my own State. I have taken the liberty to express them here, knowing that even if they should unfortunately not accord with yours, they would be kindly received.

The speech was delivered about the beginning of the anti-slavery agitation in the West, just before the formation of our State Society, and has not been followed by any similar public expressions of opinion from General Harrison. The Emancipator says—

"We submit this document as plenary proof, that the Whig Convention of 1839, has taken a lesson in tactics from the Democratic Convention in 1836, pledging its support to the slave-power, by nominating a 'northern man with southern principles,' for President."

To this it may be objected, that the "document is not plenary proof" of these assumptions, for three reasons.

1. No evidence has been presented, that the Convention at Harrisburg made any pledges to the South.

2. The speech was delivered at a period when there was a general misconception of anti-slavery doctrines and measures.

3. There have been no additional demonstrations by the opposition party, of devotion to slavery, since the nomination.

Let us not be misunderstood. We do not hold ourselves responsible for the objections. We are not the advocate of General Harrison; or any other candidate for the Presidency. Our simple desire is, to present to the reader both sides of the question.

2. The Charleston Courier publishes a brief extract from another address by General Harrison, the date of the delivery of which, we do not know; we think it was delivered somewhere about the year 1825

We subjoin it.

"Should I be asked, if there be no way by which the General Government can aid the cause of emancipation? I answer, that it has long been an object near my heart to see the whole of the surplus national revenue appropriated to that object. With the sanction of the States holding slaves, there appears to be *no constitutional objection* to its being thus applied, embracing, not only the colonization of those that may be otherwise freed, but the purchase of the freedom of others. By a zealous prosecution of a plan formed upon this basis, we might look forward to a day not far distant, when the North American sun would not look down upon a slave."

3. In 1822, just before the election in Hamilton county, he published a communication in the Inquisitor, dated September 17th, 1822, containing his political creed. It was copied with laudatory comments into the Richmond Enquirer, of October 4th, 1822. The following paragraph taken from it informs us of his creed at that time on the subject of slavery.

"I believe the existence of slavery in our country is the *greatest evil* that we at present lie under; and I believe it to be the *duty of the non-slaveholding States to offer to their sister States every inducement, and afford them every facility to get rid of this curse.* But I am equally convinced that upon Constitutional grounds, as well as those of expediency and propriety, all the measures for the accomplishment of the important object of emancipation, must be begun and supported by the States holding the slaves; the Constitution having given no power to interfere in this domestic concern without the consent of those most interested; and every step which we may take without their concurrence, will assuredly rivet the chains which we wish to break."

4. "In December, 1802, while Governor of Indiana territory, he was President of a Convention of the people of that territory, held at Vincennes, and transmitted to Congress a memorial of the Convention, praying that the sixth article of the ordinance of '87, which prohibits slavery there, *might be suspended*."—*Anti-Slavery Almanac*, 1840.

The following additional particulars have been furnished us, by a gentleman whose character and whose information with regard to that event, entitle his statements respecting it to credit.

As Governor of Indiana Territory, General Harrison was intrusted with extraordinary prerogatives. His power was almost despotic. It was to his interest, therefore, to delay rather than hasten the settlement of the territory, and its organization as a state.

At the period when the project of procuring the suspension of the anti-slavery article of the Ordinance was set on foot, a large and an increasing emigration was going on from the slave-states; but the emigrants, who were generally from the poorer and middling classes of slaveholders, passed by Indiana and went beyond the Mississippi.—The people of Indiana, especially the land-holders, became dissatisfied. They imagined, that the suspension of the article prohibiting slavery, would divert the tide of slave-state emigration to Indiana, and that the settlement of their territory, which had been taking place very slowly, would then go on more rapidly.

A convention was called to consider the measure. It was seen that the Governor's interests, supposing these to be the continued possession of extraordinary power, and peculiar facilities for speculation, were repugnant to the movement. Opposition, therefore, emanating from him, would have involved his motives in suspicion. He consulted with his friends. It was represented that the movement was for a *suspension*, not *repeal*.—The suspension was desired only for six years: at the end of that time, the whole ordinance would again take effect, and slavery would of course cease. He finally assented, and, as stated in the paragraph from the Anti-Slavery Almanac, transmitted the memorial to Congress.

Such is the substance of our informant's statement. Allowing it to be true, it is with the reader to determine whether the action of General Harrison in that movement, however wrong in principle and ill-judged, is sufficient to convict him of any friendship for slavery, or a disposition to extend the system.

5. "His efforts to make Indiana a slave-state were continued for years."—*Anti-Slavery Almanac*, 1840.

On what evidence the statement rests, we are not informed. It has been copied into some of the anti-slavery papers, but no evidence has been asked or given. The gentleman who is supposed to have furnished the reading matter for the Almanac, is a man of veracity and great carefulness, and doubtless made the statement on what he considered sufficient testimony. Will he give it to the public? Meantime, our informant, already mentioned, declares that there is not a word of truth in the statement; and his opportunities of knowing whereof he affirms, cannot be exceeded.

6. "In 1819, February 16, General Harrison voted as a member of the House of Representatives, *against* a clause prohibiting the further introduction of slavery in Missouri, and *against* a clause for the further emancipation (at 25) of slaves born within that state. Two days afterwards, he voted *against* a clause prohibiting the future introduction of slavery into Arkansas, and *against* the future emancipation of slaves born in Arkansas."—*Rochester Freeman.*

The evidence of all this, we regret to say, is conclusive. We regret it, because we cannot record with triumph the acts of any public man in favor of slavery, no matter in what motives they may have originated. Here again, however, full information ought to be given. Let General Harrison be heard in his own defence. In the fall of 1822, this gentleman was a candidate for Congress, in Hamilton county. Just before the election, a communication appeared in the Liberty Hall and Cincinnati Gazette, reviewing his votes on the Missouri and Arkansas questions, and charging him as a friend to slavery. His reply in defence of himself appeared a few days after in the same paper. We subjoin all that part which relates to slavery.

"TO THE PUBLIC.

"FELLOW-CITIZENS:—

"Being called suddenly home to attend my sick family, I have but a moment to answer a few of the calumnies which which are in circulation concerning me.

"I am accused of being friendly to slavery. From my earliest youth to the present moment, I have been the *ardent friend of Human Liberty.* At the age of 18, *I became a member of an Abolition Society* established at Richmond, Virginia; the object of which was to ameliorate the condition of slaves and *procure their freedom by every legal means.* My venerable friend Judge Gatch, of Clermont county, was also a member of this Society and has lately given me a certificate that I was one. *The obligations which I then came under I have faithfully performed.* I have been the means of liberating many slaves, *but never placed one in bondage.* I deny that my votes in Congress in relation to Missouri and Arkansas, are in the least incompatible with these principles. Congress had no more legal or constitutional right to emancipate the negroes in those sections of Louisiana without the consent of their owners, than they have to free those of Kentucky. These people were secured in their property by a solemn covenant with France when the country was purchased from that power. To prohibit the emigration of citizens of the southern states to the part of the country, the situation and climate of which, was peculiarly suited to them, would have been highly unjust as it had been purchased out of the common fund.—Particularly too when it is recollected that all the immense territory to the N. W. of the Ohio had been ceded by Virginia, and that with an unexampled liberality, she had herself proposed by excluding slavery from it to secure it for the emigration of those states which had no slaves. Was it proper then when her reserved territory was in a great measure filled up, to exclude her citizens from every part of the territory purchased out of the common fund? *I was the first person to introduce into Congress the proposition that all the country above Missouri* (which having no inhabitants was free from the objection made to Missouri and Arkansas) *should never have slavery admitted into it.* I repeat what I have before said, that as our Union was only effected by mutual concession, so only can it be preserved.

"My vote against the restriction of Missouri in forming her constitution was not a conclusive one; there would have been time enough, had I continued to be a member, before the question was decided, for my constituents to have instructed me, and I should have rejoiced in an opportunity of sacrificing my seat to my principles, if they had instructed me in opposition to my construction of the constitution.—Like many other members from the non-slaveholding states, of whom I mention Shaw, Holmes, Mason of Massachusetts, Laman of Connecticut, and Baldwin of Pennsylvania, I could see nothing in the constitution which I had sworn to support to warrant such an interference with the rights of the states and which had never before been attempted. And where is the crime in one set of men not being able to interpret the constitution as other men interpret it? As we had all *sworn* to support it, the crime would have been in giving it a construction which our consciences would not sanction. And let me ask, for what good is this question again brought up! It has been settled as all our family differences have been settled, on the firm basis of mutual compromise. And patriotism, as well as prudence devoted the effects of that *awful discussion* to eternal oblivion. Is it not known that from that cause the great fabric of our Union was shaken to its foundation! Is it not known that Missouri would not have submitted to the restriction, and that the other slaveholding states had determined to support her?—But for this compromise, the probability is that at this moment we might look upon the opposite shore of Ohio, not for an affectionate sister state, but on an armed and implacable rival. What patriotic man would not join the gallant *Eaton* in execrating the *Head and the Hand* that could devise and execute a scheme productive of a calamity so awful!

"Upon the whole, fellow citizens, our path is a plain one; it is that marked out as well by humanity as duty. We cannot emancipate the slaves of the other states without their consent, but by producing a convulsion which would undo us all. For this much to be desired event, we must wait the slow but certain progress of those good principles which are every where gaining ground, and which assuredly will ultimately prevail.

* * * * * * * * *

WILLIAM HENRY HARRISON."

Appended to this letter, we find the following note:

"More than thirty years ago, I was at a meeting of the Humane Society in the city of Richmond, Va. This society was formed first by the Quakers, and others joined the same. The intention of this institution was to abolish slavery, as far as possibly they could in all things. I was at the time living in Virginia, and William H. Harrison presented himself a candidate for membership. One of the members opposed his admittance, and but one, as his father owned a great number of slaves. The Harrison family were wealthy and respectable. I was unwell, and left the meeting, but understood that Mr. Harrison was admitted a member of the aforesaid society. All were rejected that held slaves.

PHILIP GATCH."

We are informed that Mr. Harrison's father at that time held a large number of slaves, and that all the members of the society came under a solemn pledge never to hold any.

In his letter he says:—"The obligations which I then came under I have faithfully performed"—and we feel warranted in stating, that he still considers himself bound by them.

7. General Harrison has not pledged himself openly, nor have we any evidence that he has pledged himself privately, to the South. So far as we can learn, he is bound by but one pledge, and that is, to hold office, if elected, only a single term.

8. He has not retracted publicly any thing he has said on the subject of abolition or slavery.

We have thus given our readers all we know concerning this matter, and leave the whole subject to them, without comment. The interests of our cause, we believe, do not demand from us, *at this time*, any expression of opinion. It is proper, however, that we should guard ourselves by by declaring, that we are no *partisan*, that we advocate no man's claims to the presidency, that we belong to no political party, and that, in our belief, the success of abolition efforts does not now depend on the success of either Whigs or Democrats, or indeed, on the action of any *political* party whatsoever.

MARTIN VAN BUREN—ABOLITIONISTS.

Having recorded all we know of General Harrison's acts and sayings on the slavery question, it is proper to bring to view those of Mr. Van Buren.

1. In the Senate of New York, January 29th, 1820, the following resolution was passed:

Preamble and Resolutions—Whereas, the inhibiting the further extension of slavery in these United States, is a subject of deep concern to this state, and whereas, we consider slavery as an evil much to be deplored, and that every constitutional barrier should be interposed to prevent its further extension: and that the constitution of the United States clearly giving Congress the right to require of new States not comprised within the original boundaries of the United States, the prohibition of slavery, as a condition of their admission into the Union: Therefore,

"Resolved, (if the honorable Senate concur therein,) That our senators be instructed, and our representatives in Congress be requested, to oppose the admission of States into the Union, of any territory not comprised as aforesaid, making the prohibition of slavery therein an indispensable condition of admission."

Among those who voted in the affirmative, was Martin Van Buren.

2. In 1821, he voted in the New York Convention, for allowing the colored citizens of the State the right of suffrage.

3. In 1822, he voted for the passage of a law by Congress, that every slave, imported into the territory of Florida, either directly or indirectly, except by a citizen of the United States, removing there for actual settlement, and being at the time the actual owner of the slave, should be entitled to immediate freedom.

So says the Louisville Journal.

4. March 6th, 1836, in reply to certain inquiries addressed to him from North Carolina, he made the following avowal:

"Not having, heretofore, had the honor of being in political communication with you, I am not advised whether the sentiments relating to it, which have been avowed by myself and by my authority, within the last two years, have come to your knowledge. I deem it, therefore, proper to furnish you with the substance of them, before I reply to your more specific inquiry. The avowals to which I refer, were—

1st. An opinion that Congress has no right to interfere in any manner, or to any extent, with the subject of slavery in the states.

2d. Against the propriety of their doing so in the District of Columbia; and

3. The statement of my full concurrence in the sentiments expressed by the citizens of Albany, in public meeting, the most important of which are as follows, viz: 'That the constitution of the United States carries with it an adjustment of all questions involved in the deliberations which led to its adoption; and that the compromise of interests in which it was founded, is binding in honor and good faith, *independently of the force of agreement*, on all who live under its protection, and participate in the benefits of which it is the source:' 'That the relation of master and slave is a matter exclusively belonging to the people of each state, within its own boundary, and that any attempt by the government or people of any other state, or by the general government, to interfere with or disturb it, would violate the spirit of that compromise which lies at the basis of the federal compact.' 'That we can only hope to maintain the union of the states by abstaining from all interference with the laws, domestic policy and peculiar interests of every other state:' 'That all such interference which tends to alienate one portion of our countrymen from the rest, deserves to be frowned upon with indignation by all who cherish the principles of our revolutionary fathers, and who desire to preserve the constitution by the exercise of that spirit of amity which animated its framers:' 'That they deprecated the conduct of those who are attempting to coerce their brethren in other states into the abolition of slavery, by appeals to the fears of the master and to the passions of the slave; and that they could not but consider them as disturbers of the public peace, and would, by all constitutional means, exert their influence to arrest the progress of such measures:' 'That whilst they would maintain inviolate the liberty of speech and the freedom of the press, they considered discussions, which, from their nature, tend to inflame the public mind and put in jeopardy the lives and property of their fellow-citizens, at war with every rule of moral duty, and every suggestion of humanity, and would be constrained, moreover, to regard those, who, with a full knowledge of their pernicious tendency, persist in carrying them on, as disloyal to the union:' 'That the people of the south would do great injustice if they allow themselves to believe, that the few who are interfering with the question of slavery, are acting in accordance with the sentiments of the north upon the subject;' and finally, 'that they made these declarations to their southern brethren in the same spirit of amity which bound together their fathers and ours, during a long and eventful struggle for independence; and that they did, in full remembrance of that common association, plight to them their faith to maintain in practice, as far as lies in their power, what they had thus solemnly declared.'

These views, thus expressed and sanctioned by myself, appear to me to cover the whole ground, save the abstract question in which you have been pleased to call my attention, and I cheerfully embrace the opportunity you have felt it your duty to afford me, to explain myself fully on that also. As anxious as you can possibly be, to arrest all agitation on this disturbing subject, I have considered the question you have propounded to me, with a sincere desire to arrive at the conclusion, that the subject, in respect to the District of Columbia, can be safely placed on the same ground on which it stands in regard to the states, viz: the want of constitutional power in Congress to interfere in the matter. I owe it, however, to candor, to say to you, that I have not been able to satisfy myself that the grant to Congress, in the constitution, of the power of *'exclusive legislation in all cases whatsoever'* over the Federal District, does not confer on that body the same authority over the subject that would otherwise have been possessed by the states of Maryland and Virginia; or that Congress might not, in virtue thereof, take such steps upon the subject in this District, as those states might themselves take within their own limits, and consistently with their rights of sovereignty.

Thus viewing the matter, I would not, with the lights now before me, feel myself safe in pronouncing that Congress does not possess the power of interfering with, or abolishing slavery in the District of Columbia. But, while such are my present impressions upon the abstract question of the legal power of Congress—impressions which I shall at all times be not only ready, but disposed, to surrender upon conviction of error—I do not hesitate to give it to you as my deliberate and well considered opinion, that there are objections to the exercise of this power, against the wishes of the slaveholding states, *as imperative in their nature and obligations*, in regulating the conduct of public men, *as the most palpable want of constitutional power would be.*

You have alluded in your letter to the conspicuous situation in which I have been placed before the public, and I take it for granted, that it is to that circumstance, rather than to any other, that I am to ascribe the solicitude felt by yourselves and your fellow-citizens in respect to my views on this subject. I recognise, to the fullest extent, the propriety of this desire on your part; and although there is nothing in your letter making the avowal necessary, I prefer that not only you, but all the people of the United States shall now understand, that if the desire of that portion of them which is favorable to my elevation to the chief magistracy, should be gratified, I must go into the Presidential chair the inflexible and uncompromising opponent of any attempt on the part of Congress to abolish slavery in the District of Columbia, against the wishes of the slaveholding states; and also with the determination *equally decided*, to resist the slightest interference with the subject in the states where it exists."

5. In 1837, he pledged himself in advance, to veto any bill that might be passed by Congress for the abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia, against the wishes of the slave-states.

6. By his influence, and the power of the party supporting him, the freedom of debate in Congress on the subject of slavery, and the right of petition, have been, ever since his election, substantially destroyed.

7. Facts detailed in Judge Jay's recent work, and facts within reach of every inquirer, demonstrate, that he is entirely subservient to the slaveholding interest.

EMANCIPATOR.

During the period of our connection with the anti-slavery press, we have had no unpleasant differences with any of its conductors. We appeal to our readers, whether in the controversy on the subject of political action, we have indulged in any dogmatism, harshness of expression, or impeachment of motive, towards our editorial brethren. Not unfrequently of late, we have detected a disposition in one or two of our Eastern friends to substitute odious epithets for argument, and by certain tricks of phraseology to place us in a false position. We allude specially to the Emancipator. This paper not long since indirectly questioned the purity of our motives. Attributing the indecorum to excess of zeal in behalf of its favorite notions, we did not think it required any serious strictures. But, like our friend of the Emancipator, we are human. We cannot permit him to *misrepresent* our opinions, and place us in a *false position.* This he has done, as shall now be shown.

In his paper of January 16th, we find this paragraph.

"ABOLITION MADE AGREEABLE.—We copy the following paragraph, from that devoted pro-slavery Whig newspaper, the Lynchburg Virginian, for the purpose of showing our honored brothers, Gates, Bailey, &c., how much satisfaction their "Abolition made Agreeable" affords at the South. This idea of carrying out the abolition enterprise through the two existing parties, one headed by Van Buren and Calhoun, and the other by Harrison and Tyler, takes hugely at the South. It is a decided improvement upon even the colonization compromise, which only contemplated giving slavery a lease for a term of years—two hundred years indeed, but that is a trifle in the lifetime of a nation. Whereas the other concedes by quitclaim, interest as long as the politicians can keep up a question popular enough to preserve the present parties in being—a life-lease almost equal to a fee-simple forever."

Had not this paragraph been penned by one, in whom we have reposed great confidence, we should pronounce it *dishonest*. All that we now feel warranted in saying is, that it is extremely *injurious* to us.

1. It classifies Mr. Gates and ourself, as holding the same opinions. If we mistake not, Mr. Gates, who by the way has shown himself a spirited Abolitionist in Congress, believes that the success of Abolitionism depends to a great extent on the success of the Whig party, and that Abolitionists are therefore bound to sustain this party. The editor of the Emancipator *knows*, that we have never advocated this opinion, or said any thing in our paper that could give countenance to it. We never have entertained the opinion; we do not now entertain it. We feel indignant that the Emancipator should be careless enough to charge it upon us.

2. He wishes to show to his "honored brothers, Gates and Bailey, how much satisfaction their Abolition made Agreeable, affords to the South."

To say the least, this is sadly disingenuous. When have we ever professed to make Abolition agreeable? When have we ever shown a disposition to do so? "Their 'abolition made agreeable!'" Such an insinuation does no honor to his "honored brothers;" and, moreover, so far as we are concerned, is untrue. Neither do we believe that it is just to Mr. Gates.

3. He quotes the article to show, how much satisfaction our "Abolition made Agreeable" gives to the South. He knows or ought to know, that it gives no satisfaction at all—and that in the article quoted, there is not the slightest allusion to *our* abolition. The Virginian foolishly *misrepresents* Mr. Gates' opinion, by stating that this gentleman "is endeavoring to show *the impracticability of immediate abolition*, and the folly of mingling abolition with politics;" and thereupon the Emancipator quotes it to show, how much satisfaction *our* "Abolition made agreeable" is giving to the South! What all this has to do with our creed on the subject, we cannot see. But the object is manifest. The Emancipator wishes to cast *odium* upon the doctrines of the Philanthropist, that it is inexpedient to form a third political party, and that candidates for office should be required to be sound on all points of the slavery-question, where they may lawfully be called upon to act.

Brother Leavitt! this is not right.

4. He says "this idea of carrying out the Abolition-enterprise through the two existing parties, one headed by Van Buren and Calhoun, and the other by Harrison and Tyler, takes hugely at the South."

Here is wrong done again. The great majority of Abolitionists believe, that it is better to reform existing parties in the North on the subject of human rights by moral means, than to attempt to destroy them by a new political organization. Mr. Leavitt's statement is a caricature. To say that this notion of the majority of Abolitionists "takes hugely at the South," needs no answer.

Our brother of the Emancipator will allow us to say, that caricature and sarcasm are not exactly the right weapons to use against his brethren. Others beside himself can wield them, but for the sake of fraternal feeling, their use had better be dispensed with.

Hereafter we hope the Emancipator will recollect, that the Philanthropist holds precisely the same opinions which were held by the Abolition organization up to the period of the Albany Convention. And we moreover respectfully pray, *not to be misrepresented.*

We give the article from the Virginian, which is made the basis of the disingenuous paragraph from the Emancipator.

From the Lynchburg Virginian, Nov. 25.

ABOLITION AND POLITICS.—It is a remarkable feature of the present political contest, that, while Van Buren men in the non-slaveholding States are almost every where *profiting* by the abolition question, they are in the South eternally charging a coalition between the abolitionists and the Northern Whigs. We have recently seen *avowed abolitionists* run by that party as Governor of Massachusetts, and as Member of Congress from Rode Island—selected as candidates, doubtless, because of their undisguised connection with the Fanatics, for the purpose of adding to their strength—and yet, in the very southern papers which denounce *Whig Abolitionism*, these facts are either passed by without comment, or are never made known to their readers! We refer the public to two articles on this subject, which we copy this morning from the N. Y. Courier and U. S. Gazette, in which the deceptive course of the Van Buren journals is clearly exposed.

Recently, however, an occurrence has taken place, which seems to have furnished the Washington Globe with a peg upon which to hang an argument; and the jesuitical article of the Government organ is eagerly transferred to the columns of the Richmond Enquirer. It seems that Seth M. Gates, a Whig member of Congress from the Genesee district, New York, recently addressed a letter to Gerrit Smith of Peterborough, a notorious ally of the Tappans, for the purpose of persuading him that the clamor for "*immediate abolition*" is actually operating against *abolition* altogether, and recommending therefore less violence, and the adoption of SLOWER AND MORE GRADUAL MEANS to effect their object. Mr. Gates also avowed that, though an abolitionist, he is a whig, and he protests against organizing a third, or abolition party, and is in favor of keeping that question aloof from politics altogether. Let it be recollected that we have never denied that among the Whigs of the North there are many abolitionists—on the contrary, we have frequently admitted it, as we do still—all that we contend for is that the *abolitionists* are not *all Whigs*—that as many of them, in fact, belong to the one party as to the other—in one word, that abolition is a question of *sections* and not of *parties.* Mr. Gates, for example, is a Whig—but who is Gerrit Smith? Certainly not a whig now, although he was a whig before he became an abolitionist? We recollect very well to have seen, just before the late election in New York came on, an address from Gerrit Smith to the electors of his county, copied into the New York Evening Post, the organ both of the abolitionists and of Tammany Hall, with eulogistic comments both upon the writer and his sentiments, and of course in opposition to the whig cause. What is the result then? Seth M. Gates, who is endeavoring to show *the impracticability of immediate abolition, and the folly of mingling abolition with politics, is a whig;* while his correspondent, Gerrit Smith, who is in favor of immediate abolition, and also for bringing that question to bear upon popular elections, is a Van Buren man! And yet it is by reference to facts of this sort, that the Globe and the Enquirer hope to convince the people of the South that there is a coalition between the abolitionists and the northern whigs! They prove, when analyzed, directly the reverse; and we should be astonished at any allusion to them by these prints, if we had not often before witnessed their amazing reliance upon the ignorance and credulity of their readers.

OUR POSITION, ONCE MORE.

The editor of the Pennsylvania Freeman replies to our article on his strictures, in a very unsatisfactory way. "We did not say," he remarks, "that the democratic and whig abolitionists alluded to, would be *justified*, or find themselves justified by the course of the Philanthropist. But we *did* say, and we said it with ample proof of the fact before us, that these men would *justify themselves* for their party votes, by quoting the doctrines of the editor of the Philanthropist, which he reiterates in the paper before us."

The question is not, whether they will *justify themselves* by the doctrines in doing so and so, but, whether the doctrines be *true*. If they be true, their liability to perversion is no argument against them.

The Freeman further remarks—"Our friend Bailey enters into a long argument in defence of his course, based upon the assumption, to use his own words, that *'the question of immediate emancipation cannot legitimately come up between candidates* (it should be, *electors* and candidates) *in non-slaveholding states.'*

"The doctrine is not *original* with our brother of the Philanthropist. It has been strenuously maintained by party politicians from the beginning of our enterprise. It sounds to us vastly like the old query:—'what have we to do with slavery at the North?'"

It should be recollected, that we were speaking of immediate emancipation in the states, when we said that the question of immediate emancipation could not legitimately come up between electors and candidates in non-slaveholding states. The Freeman does not attempt to *disprove* the assumption, but would make it *odious*, by saying, that party-politicians from the beginning have also maintained it. What if they have? What has this to do with its truth or falseness? Friend Whittier, why prefer an *appeal to prejudice*, to an *appeal to reason?* We remark, however, that this is not *the* point which party-politicians from the beginning have maintained against Abolitionists. The assumption which has divided them and us, has been, that Abolition "has nothing to do with politics." Against this *we* have fought as earnestly as did ever the *Freeman*. Abolitionism is obliged to connect itself with politics in the free states, because our national and state-legislation is disgraced by numerous provisions tending to uphold slavery.

But, our usually clear-sighted friend must have taken a very imperfect view of our article. For, after quoting our saying, that the question of immediate emancipation cannot legitimately come up between electors and candidates in non-slaveholding states, he says:—"Reasoning from this assumption, he proceeds:

"So long as our legislators in the free states, have nothing to do in their legislative capacity with the abolition of slavery in the states, electors have nothing to do with their *opinions* on this question. If they are sound on all points of legislation, touching our free colored people, if they are opposed to all legislative action tending in any way to uphold slavery, it is all we have a right to demand. To reject them because they do not happen to concur with us in opinion upon the great doctrines of immediate emancipation, cannot, as we think, be vindicated in the eye of common sense."

Now, if he had examined our argument with sufficient care, he would have found, that the assumption he makes us reason from, is *no part of the main argument*, but is made somewhere near the middle of our article, *in reply to an objection;* and that we used it simply to show, that no *sanction* could be given by electors in non-slaveholding states to the erroneous notions of a candidate on the question of immediate emancipation in the states, by simply giving him their votes. He would moreover have found, that the *reasoning* which he makes dependent on it, is no reasoning at all, but a series *of propositions*, enunciated almost in the *beginning* of our article. Finally, he would have found, that instead of entering into a *long argument* in defence of our course, we chiefly attempted to *reply to certain objections*, which had been made to our *previous* argument on the subject.

But, we have not yet done with the Freeman. His remarks, we think, show too much haste.

Commenting on our position—"that, so long as our legislators in the free states have nothing to do in their legislative capacity with the abolition of slavery in the states, electors have nothing to do with their opinions on this question"—he remarks:

"It is a notoriously wrong assumption, that 'legislators in a free state have nothing to do in their legislative capacity, with slavery in the states.' Had the legislators of Ohio nothing to do with slavery in the state of Kentucky, last winter? Let the "BLACK LAW" answer."

We did not say, that legislators in a free state in their legislative capacity had nothing to do with *slavery* in the states. We said, the *abolition of slavery* there. And now we ask Friend Whittier—had the Legislature of Ohio as such, any thing to do with the *abolition* of slavery in Kentucky? If so, what? If not, how is our assumption "notoriously wrong?"

"Look at the demands," he continues, "not long ago made upon the legislatures of the free states, for legislative action *for the protection of slavery in the states*, from the doctrine of immediate emancipation." Well—what does this prove? That free state legislatures have any right to legislate for the protection of slavery in the South? That they have any right to legislate for its abolition? If not, then the remark is irrelevant—it does not touch our assumption. "Look," he continues again, "at the present position of Georgia and Maine—of New York and Virginia. Is it of no consequence to abolitionists, what are the opinions of the men who, by virtue of their votes, hold a place in their respective states? Is it not important, that with them, the cause of freedom shold be the predominant interest?"

Yea! yea! to both these questions. *Therefore*, would we require from free-state legislators—*what?* that they should make vague professions of attachment to "freedom," to the rights of man, to general liberty, or of belief in the doctrine of immediate abolition in reference to state-slavery? No! —we would require of them to repeal all legislation in their several states which now aids or countenances slavery, and with the spirit of freemen to resist every encroachment of the evil on their own institutions, or the national government. We, probably, are more exacting than friend Whitti Does he remember with what pleasure some t years since he quoted Dr. Duncan's celebrat anathemas against slavery? The famous Congre man almost passed with our brother, for an Ab litionist. *We* were not so highly delighted. W all his voluminous periods about the curse of s very, Dr. Duncan played the non-committal on t most important practical question propounded him—"Ought slavery to be immediately abolis in the District of Columbia?" He dodged t question—and *lost our vote.* We thought it more importance to know his opinions, on a qu tion which he might be called upon to deci than to learn how much he hated slavery in t South, and how glad he [illegible] ished there immediately.

That the time *will* come, when a disbelief i doctrines of immediate emancipation will ind so much depravity or wilful ignorance in a m as to disqualify him for office, we have no d That it *has* come, our daily observation contra Meantime, we wish to pursue a course, wh while it involves no sacrifice of principle, ca vindicated in the eye of common sense, and w not in effect disfranchise Abolitionists. T course is, to vote for no man for the Presid or for Congress, for the Governorship, or Leg ture, whom we have not the most satisfactory r sons for believing, in favor of reforming i constitutional way, our national and free s policy and legislation, in all points, which in way tend to aid or countenance slavery.

We hope now that we are understood. however, who would occupy a just medium any enterprise, must make up his mind to be understood; and so bear it patiently.

OHIO LEGISLATURE.

We can hardly understand what this legisla would be at. Mr. Flood's principal resolu we believe, received the go-by; since which t the following resolutions have been introduced Mr. Fisher of Shelby.

"*Resolved*, That the union of the States m be preserved.

Resolved, That the false, violent and inflam tory speeches, resolutions and garbled statem of the abolitionists respecting slavery, are a g violation of the spirit of compromise, which i up, and now cements the union of the States, a concealed attempt at the dissolution of the Uni

Resolved, That the most efficient means sh be resorted to, to counteract the attempt now ing made by the abolitionists to organize a p ical abolition party for the purpose of arra the north against the south.

Resolved, That the conduct of the abolition is calculated to excite insurrection among slaves, and is (if not directly,) indirectly a gua ty on the part of the abolitionists to assist slaves in the indiscriminate buchery and mu of the slave holders.

Resolved, That slavery, as it exists in the so ern portion of the confederacy, is guarantied the constitution of the United States, and that nothern States are bound to protect the sout in the peaceable enjoyment of their domestic i tutions as they now exist.

Resolved, That the person secreting a runa negro slave, or aiding the same to escape shoul punishedby imprisonment in the penitentiary an answerable to the party injured in four fold dama

Resolved, That in the opinion of this Ho the black and white races were never designed Providence to intermingle together as one peop

Resolved, That the abolitionists in inducing procuring the settlement of large numbers of bl within the limits of this State, are directly inju the character of the State, endangering the pea our citizens, and promoting vice and immorali

Resolved, That a law should be passed, pro iting the settlement of blacks within the limi this State.

Resolved, That the attempt of the abolitio to extinguish the Anglo Saxon race, by amalga tion with the black race, deserves the execra of every friend of his country, and of mankin

Therefore, *Resolved*, That the Judiciary C mittee be requested to examine the subject ref to in the foregoing resolutions, and to report to House, such amendments and provisions to the relating to the subject, as may be deemed nece ry to preserve the character of the State, an security of our citizens."

We would suggest to the legislature, the pr ety of establishing a new office—viz., the of negro overseer and slave catcher for the sta Ohio. Mr. Fisher's natural proclivity [illegible] would fit him admirably for the station.

ANTI-SLAVERY NOTICE.

☞ There will be a meeting held in Mr. I derson's Church, near Hanover, Jefferson co the 22d of February next, for the purpose of fo ing a County Abolition Society. A general dance is earnestly solicited by MANY

January 23d, 1840.

RECEIPTS.

PLEDGES AND DONATIONS.

From December 14, 1839, to January 31 1840.

Ripley A. S. Soc., pledge for 1838, 45,00; Putnam
Soc. pledge, 23,00; New Town, Musk. co. pledge,
Judge Jas. McGibeny, 5.0 ; Wm. Bebee. 3,00; Utica
Soc., pledge, 15,00; Mary Poage, 8,00; Knox co. A. S
pledge, 4,00; Mrs. S. Courtland, ind. do., 2.00; David
by. ind. do., 1 00; Jos. Eaton, donation, 2.50; M.
donation on Mahan case, 10,00; Sundry individu
Fairfield, Ia., per Rev. A. W. Leftwick, 7,00; Wm. H
25 cts.; Deersfield, Morgan co. A. S. Soc. per A. A. G
rie, 27,00.

WM. DONALDSON, *Treasu*

FOR PHILANTHROPIST.

From December 14, 1839, to January 31, 1840

Hon. John Brundidge, $5,00; John Mosher, 2,50; J.
ington, 1,15; Henry Crabbs, 2,00; David McPherson,
S. G. Salisbury, 2.50; Thrap & Hoskins, 2,00; R
Worrals & Burke, 1,00; Col. John Caldwell, 2,50; A
A. Brewer, 5.00; Peter R. Dunn, Esq., 2,50; A. C. B
2.50; Thos. McNaughton, 2,50; L. W. Knowlton,
Jas. S. Irvine, 1,00; Rev. Saml. Steele, 2,50, Wm. P
nard, 2,50; Obed Beard, 2.50; Cushing Counningham,
Stephen Porter, 2.50; Wm. Griffin, 2,50; David Aod
3,00; Asahel Kellogg, 2.50; Chas. Jones, 2,50; A. Co
Jr., 2,50; Wm. Doane, 2.50; J. S. Mills, 5.00; Jno. M
roy, 5,00; Jas. McFarland, 2,50; Peter Kirkpatrick,
Nathan Thomas, 3,00; Loring Prince, 1,00; Jas. Mi
2.50; Mrs. Eliz. Blair, 2.50; Wm. Webster, 3 00; C
Carpenter, 2,50; Mrs. L. Courtland, 2.50; Lysander C
5,50; Asahel Kellogg, 50cts.; James Frame, 2,50; W
Thom, 2,50; John Amen, 2,50; Joseph Walker, 1.25;
Birney, 80cts.; Robert Huggins, 2.50; Norman Pa
2.00; David Pollock, 2.50; Jas. McGibeny, 2,50; Nao
& Lane, 2,50; Dunn & Moore, 2,50; Amassa Gillett,
Matthew McKeever, 5,00; William Wilson, 5,00; V
Reed, 2.50; Jon. Smiley, 2,50; Wm. Perry, 7,50;
Grave, 2,00; Solomon Thomas, 2.50; Charles Atk
50cts.; Thos. Donaldson, 2.50; Thos. M. McCollough,
Jas. Ewing, 2.50; Jno. Ramsay, 2 50; David Ramsay
Saml. Ramsay, 2,50; Wm. C. Brown, 3,00; Rev. Jo
vey, 2.00; David B. Bryant, 2,50; Bailey & Hoge,
Jos. Eaton, 2,50; Rev. Saml. McArthur, 2,00; Barn
Huot, 2,50; Saml. V. Roll, 2,50; Seymour Stevens,
John Bonds, 3,00; Jas. Jodkins, 3,00; Robert Aylesw
1.00; P. J. Howland, 2 00; Henry Dosten, 2.50; Th
McGarrough, 2.00; Th. Eubank, 95cts; Jos. Hall, 2,50;
Jno. Eubank, 2,50; George Anderson, 5.00; J. S. Carpe
3,00; D. & J. Erskine, 2.50; Th. R. George, 2.50; Mrs.
den, 3,00; Warren Park, 5.00; D. S. Richards, 2.50;
Knapp, 50cts.; Thos. T. Clapp, 2.00; Clapp & Ga
1.00; G. R. Brown, 2,00; Doct. Carter, 1.88; Ab
nyne, 1,00; Dennis Hill, 2 50; Ralph Hickox,
Messer, 2,50; Asher Coburn, 2,50; Eli
Thos. McGee, 3,00.

WM. D

(Continued from First Page.)

with us in making such a response to these petitioners. If they will not, we ought to know it. I believe they will.—I cannot believe that the descendants of those patriots who fought the battles of liberty at Lexington, Bunker Hill, and other fields famous in our country's history, will be so recreant to the principles of the American Revolution as to lend themselves to the wicked schemes of the abolitionists; and I am therefore convinced that the best interests of the whole country, the South and the North, require us to pursue the course I have indicated; and, thus believing, I will vote against the resolution offered by the gentleman from South Carolina, (Mr. Thompson,) and every proposition of a similar character, so that I may have an opportunity of voting for a proposition similar to that offered by the gentleman from Louisiana, (Mr. Chinn.)

Thursday, Jan. 16 1840.

Mr. BOTTS having obtained the floor after several ineffectual efforts, said: Mr. Speaker, I hope it will not appear unreasonable or unnatural that I should have manifested some anxiety to obtain the floor, when it is recollected that I was the first to propose to give an exposition of my views on the question before the House, and was arrested by the Chair when I had got just so far as probably to leave it in doubt what course I intended to adopt. I am happy in the belief that that effort to explain, on my part, has been the means of affording the opportunity to others to explain their positions with a calmness, moderation, dignity, and good feeling, that has never characterized the discussions in this House on this subject before. This, Mr. Speaker, is a question about which I never have been excited, and do not mean to be excited; it is one that I am disposed to look sternly in the face, and meet as becomes a man.

I have ever maintained the opinion, and that opinion has been strongly confirmed by intercourse here, that our friends of the South have acted indiscreetly on this subject, and have permitted false issues to be made before this House and the country by our political opponents, which has done great and violent injustice to the Northern Whigs, and furnished the Administration party with political capital to trade upon in the South.

It is of no consequence to me whether the right of petition is involved in this question or not; it is enough for me to know that the most distinguished men in this House—and true friends to the South—regard it in that light, and act upon it as if it were, and are thus, without reason, associated with the abolition party, and thereby have the weight of their names and influence thrown into the scale of those desperate and despicable fanatics. The whole country is deceived upon this subject, and it is time that their eyes were opened to the true state of the case; and it is likewise time that the Administration party here were checked in their design to keep this question alive for political purposes.

Now, sir, if these petitions were received, referred, reported upon, and a distinct issue presented and acted upon, you would find that the abolitionists had so little to hope from Congress that we should no longer be harassed with their famous applications; and, as it is, there is a constant state and interminable contest kept up here about receiving their petitions; and it is taken for granted that all who are favorable to the reception of their petitions are inclined to grant the prayer of the petitions, while I venture to say that there are not a dozen men in this House so disposed.

[Cries of "No, not five."]

Does not every consideration of policy and propriety, then, require us to put an end to this question by receiving their petitions, and quieting the question as to the right of petition; which has identified thousands and thousands of individuals with these abolition petitions, and which must continue to increase them—and then promptly and decisively to reject their prayer?

Why, sir, what great terror is there in a petition? A man may ask for any thing he sees fit, and he may make a very impertinent request; but there is nothing in that to alarm the half or three-fourths of a nation. The question is, *will you, can you, have you the power to grant* his request?—and it is to this point, directly and unequivocally, that I desire to see a vote of this House, that the whole Southern country may see; really and truly, how we stand—who are with us, and who against us. I deny the constitutional power of Congress to exercise jurisdiction over the subject; and I desire to know, in the first place, how many, and who they are, that think with me, and then I want to know how many are for the exercise of this power. The sooner the truth is put in possession of correct information on this subject, the better for their interests.

I confess that I regard this question of the right of petition a very interesting question. I think the right of petition guarantied to the humblest citizen of the country, and I am inclined to think it carries with it the necessary obligation to consider; for what does the right of petition amount to, if it is only to present a paper to be thrown behind the fire? And I am not certain that, under the Constitution, the right is not *unlimited*, for I cannot precisely see who is to draw the line, or where it is to be drawn. But, sir, all the old women and Sunday school children in the North may pile petition upon petition here, and it would not disturb my composure; it will be time enough for that when a serious design is entertained to grant their prayer.

In regard to slavery itself, I have but one argument to use, and that is, it is our property—we hold it under the Constitution; and if you desire to take it from us, do it at your own peril. But, in the mean time, I want to be acquainted with the actual strength of those who entertain such a design.

I am satisfied that this is the best course to adopt for the protection of Southern interests, and no man here represents a stronger Southern interest than I do, and, as at present advised, it is the course that I shall pursue.

Note.—In order to fortify and establish the position I have taken, that this matter is kept alive for political effect, let the course of the House be observed. When leave was asked, a few days since, by my friends, to allow me to speak on this subject, after the previous question had been ordered, I was refused by a strict party vote, or nearly so, 93 to 104 noes—the whole of the Southern democrats voting against leave for a Southern man, who, with them, represented Southern interests, and who went much further than some of them in denying the constitutional power of Congress to legislate on the subject, because discussion was to be deprecated; while the same party voted, the next day, *against the previous question, to allow* Mr. Slade, of Vermont, an avowed abolitionist, to speak, (he having manifested great anxiety on the subject,) and as soon after that speech was delivered, and the floor could be obtained for the purpose, the same party then *endeavored to carry* the previous question, having something, as they suppose, out of which they can manufacture political capital.]

CONGRESS.

Saturday, 18th.

The business first in order was the proposition of Mr. W. Thompson, S. Carolina, to amend the Rules and Orders of the House by adding thereto the following:

"Upon the presentation of any memorial or petition praying for the abolition of slavery or the slave-trade in any District, Territory, or State of the Union, and upon the presentation of any resolution or other paper touching these subjects, the question of the reception of such memorial, petition, resolution, or paper shall be considered as made, and the question of its reception shall be laid upon the table without debate or further action of the House."

Mr. SLADE, who was entitled to the floor, being about to address the House—

Mr. LEET asked him to give way to enable him to make a motion that the House now proceed to the election of Printer.

[Mr. Slade declined—other business then intervened.—Phil.]

Mr. SLADE then resumed the floor, and addressed the House on the general subject of Mr. W. Thompson's resolution, until a little past 6 o'clock, when he yielded to a motion for adjournment, which prevailed.

And the House adjourned.

Monday 20th.

After a correction of the Journal, in which Mr. Keim's vote had been wrongly recorded—

Mr. SLADE, who had the floor from Saturday, rose and continued his speech in opposition to *Mr. W. Thompson's* resolution in regard to the reception of abolition memorials, in which he went at large into the general subject. He continued to occupy the floor until a quarter past three o'clock.

After Mr. Slade had concluded—

Mr. GARLAND, of Virginia, obtained the floor.

Mr. R. GARLAND asked *Mr. G.* to give way, to enable him to have read a proposition which he desired to submit as an amendment.

Mr. ALFORD objected. He should [he said] object to the introduction of all propositions, until such time as every gentleman who might wish to be heard on the proposition immediately before the House had spoken. He was himself anxious to be heard, and had given notice to the House to that effect a week ago. So far as he was concerned, he would not submit to any action, until this proposition was fully and fairly discussed.

Mr. R. GARLAND said he did not wish to offer the proposition at this time; he merely wished it might be read.

Mr. GARLAND, of Virginia, expressed his willingness to bring the proposition to the notice of the House, in behalf of the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. ALFORD said he should object.

The reading of *Mr.* Rice Garland's proposition was [illegible].

Mr. ALFORD objected.

Some conversation ensued, when *Mr.* GARLAND, of Virginia, yielded the floor to *Mr.* BLACK, who moved an adjournment.

The yeas and nays were called for and ordered, and being taken, were, in favor of the motion 55, against it 52.

The House adjourned.

Tuesday, January 21st.

Mr. GARLAND, of Virginia, who was entitled to the [illegible] Thompson's resolution in regard to the reception of abolition petitions, memorials, &c.

When *Mr.* W. C. JOHNSON requested *Mr.* G. to yield the floor for a moment to enable him to offer the following resolution; which was read for information:

Resolved, That the Clerk inform the Mayor of Washington that he have leave to take from the surplus wood belonging to this House 40 cords, if so much be necessary, for immediate distribution among the suffering poor of the city.

Mr. GARLAND expressed his entire willingness to yield the floor, provided it was generally understood that he should proceed so soon as the resolution was disposed of.

Mr. GRIFFIN objected to the introduction of the resolution.

Mr. W. C. JOHNSON indicated that he would move a suspension of the rule, provided the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Garland] would yield the floor for that purpose. A resolution of a similar character had been repeatedly adopted.

Mr. GARLAND inquired of the Chair whether, if he yielded the floor, it would be understood that he should proceed in his remarks after the motion had been disposed of?

The SPEAKER said there could be no such understanding. If the gentleman yielded the floor, he might be permitted to resume it again by general consent.

So Mr. G. did not yield.

Mr. POPE asked Mr Garland to yield the floor for the purpose of enabling him to lay on the table, with a view to have printed, a report on the subject of the disputed boundary of Iowa.

Several objections were made—mingled with cries of "it is no use—there is no one to print it."

A similar application was made by Mr. PROFFIT, for the purpose of enabling him to introduce a resolution which he [Mr. P.] deemed of great importance, as calling for information which the country—the whole country demanded.—Mr. P. said that if the introduction of the resolution gave rise to one word of debate—if a single objection was made—he would consider it his duty, in return for the courtesy of the gentleman from Virginia to withdraw the resolution, giving notice, however, that upon the first opportunity the subject should be brought before the House.

Mr. Garland having yielded the floor, Mr. Proffit read the following resolution:

Resolved, That the Secretary of War be directed to inform this House, at his *earliest* convenience, whether he has or has not ordered or authorized the use of *bloodhounds* in the war with the Indians in Florida; also, if such order or authority has been given, whether any *importation* of *bloodhounds* has been ordered, and from what country; also, the name of the agent employed to purchase and select said *bloodhounds*; also, the number of *bloodhounds* ordered; also, whether any *bloodhounds* have actually arrived; and also, if the use of *bloodhounds* is determined on, the Secretary of War is further directed to state the *name* of the officer in the American Army under whose immediate charge and *command* said *bloodhounds* are to be used.

After the resolution was read, some member making objection to its introduction, Mr. Proffit withdrew it.

Mr. Garland then proceeded in his remarks, and addressed the House until half past one o'clock.

Mr. BUTLER, of S. C. followed in some remarks, in the course of which he vindicated the Administration and the Administration party generally from the imputation of favoring the doctrines of abolition, the advocacy of which, he contended, was one of the characteristics of the Whig party of the present day. Mr. B. was once or twice called to order by the Chair, but proceeded with his remarks, in obedience to a call from several parts of the House that he should do so.

Mr. DROMGOOLE rose, he said, for the purpose of bringing this debate to a close. He would not undertake to reply to remarks that had been made by other gentlemen because, from the motion he was about to submit he did not consider himself at liberty to take part in the discussion, either on the one side or the other. The simple question to be decided was, whether the House would adopt a standing rule in regard to certain classes of petitions which, as experience had shown, were crowding in upon them, and in relation to which the House must have some standing regulation. Four years' experience had shown that the only practicable mode of quietly disposing of these petitions was to permit them to be presented by the gentlemen who might hold them, and then quietly to consign them to the table.—He had risen, therefore, for the purpose of moving an amendment to the pending proposition, which would conform to the previous practice of the House. Intending, as he did, to put an end to the discussion by moving the previous question, he would not go into the discussion, as it might have the appearance of presenting him in the light of doing an unfair thing by preventing reply. He moved to amend Mr. W. Thompson's resolution by striking out all after the words "of any," in the first line, and inserting—

"Petitions, memorials, remonstrances, addresses, resolutions, propositions, or papers of any description, touching the abolition of slavery or the slave trade in the District of Columbia, in the Territories of the United States, or in any State of this Union, or the transportation of slaves from any State, District, or Territory of the United States, to any other State, District, or Territory, or relating in whole, or in part, in any way, or to any extent whatsoever, to these subjects, shall be laid upon the table without a question, and without action or debate, and the same shall not be printed."

Mr. D. made a few further remarks in support of his amendment; when

Mr. ADAMS rose to make an inquiry from the Chair on a point of order, but the Reporter could not hear it.

Mr. DROMGOOLE then moved the previous question.

Some discussion followed on a point of order.

After which, Mr. Dromgoole's amendment was propounded to the House; when

Mr. BRIGGS contended that, as this amendment proposed the same disposition of abolition memorials, &c. as was proposed by the resolution offered a few days since by Mr. Coles, of Virginia, and which had been laid on the table, it could not be in order.

Both the resolutions were read, and the point of order debated for an hour, when the Chair decided the amendment of Mr. Dromgoole to be out of order.

From this decision Mr. DROMGOOLE took an appeal; but the decision of the Chair was affirmed by the House—Yeas 120, nays 64.

A contest now took place for the floor; Mr. BLACK claiming it to offer a short amendment declaring that abolition memorials should not be received.

Mr. DROMGOOLE finally obtained it to speak to the original resolution, (Mr. Thompson's;) whereupon, after remarking upon the length and unprofitableness of the debate, he moved the previous question.

Strong appeals were made to him by Messrs. W. COST JOHNSON and DAWSON to withdraw it, and he asked leave to explain; but the House refusing, he adhered to his motion.

Mr. HOFFMAN then moved a call of the House; which motion prevailing, the House was called accordingly. The doors were closed, and absentees called; when the call was suspended.

Mr. W. Thompson's amendment having been read, the Chair inquired whether Mr. Dromgoole's call for the previous question was seconded?

Mr. HOWARD, of Indiana, inquired whether it would be in order to move to lay the resolution of Mr. Thompson on the table?

The CHAIR replying in the affirmative, he said that he should not make the motion till he had stated his reasons; but the House refusing leave,

The question was put on seconding the call for the previous question, and decided, by tellers, in the negative—ayes 98, noes 99.

Mr. ADAMS thereupon offered the following amendment:

Resolved, That the following be added to the standing rules of this House, to be numbered the 21st:

"Every petition presented by the Speaker, or by any member, with a brief verbal statement of its contents, shall be received, unless objection be made to its reception for special reason; and whenever objection shall be made to the reception of a petition, the name of the member objecting, and the reason of the objection, shall be entered upon the journal. The question in every such case shall be, *Shall the petition be rejected?* and no petition shall be rejected but by a majority of the members present."

He said the proposition was general in its character, not referring to abolition petitions more than to all others. It proposed that none should be rejected, but by a majority, and for reasons assigned. It admitted the principle that the House might reject a memorial; but insisted that the name of the person objecting should be recorded, and the reasons for the rejection given.

He thereupon moved an adjournment.

And the House adjourned.

Wednesday 22d.

Mr. JONES, from the Committee of Ways and Means, reported the military appropriation bill for the year 1840; which, with certain documents and estimates accompanying it, was laid upon the table and ordered to be printed.

Mr. R. GARLAND asked how the printing was to be done, no printer having been appointed, and the resolution authorizing the Clerk to have the printing done having expired?

Mr. JONES said all he had moved was the order to print. But he would further ask leave to introduce a resolution empowering the Clerk of the House for ten days longer to get the printing of the House done under the resolution of 1819. He said that the public service imperiously required that some such order be passed. It was now impossible for the members of the House to inform themselves or Congress on some of the bills, already reported, which was necessary before the 1st of March; and unless the bills and explanatory documents accompanying them were printed, how could members inform themselves so as to be prepared to vote understandingly in regard to them?

The CHAIR said the resolution could be offered only by general consent.

Mr. R. GARLAND objected.

Mr. W. COST JOHNSON requested Mr. Jones to modify his resolution so as to confine it to the bills and documents which had thus far been reported.

To this Mr. JONES assented.

Mr. R. GARLAND said he must still object, unless the gentleman would further modify his resolution so as to require the Clerk to get this printing done on the best terms which could be obtained in the District.

Mr. JONES said he saw it was impossible for him to shape his resolution so as to please every body; he had already yielded with a view to meet the wishes of gentlemen, but he could go no further.

Mr. R. GARLAND. Then I object.

Mr. JONES. I must then move that the rule be suspended to allow me to move the resolution.

Mr. BRIGGS, of Massachusetts, thought it would be better to reconsider the order to print, and modify the order as now proposed by the mover: then the vote of a simple majority would be sufficient, whereas the rules could not be suspended but by a vote of two-thirds. He moved a reconsideration.

Mr. RICE GARLAND said he hoped the House would not reconsider; he should give his vote against it. Instead of the House appointing a printer, or taking up the resolution which had been moved as to a more economical mode of having the printing done, it was attempted, by a roundabout process, to let the Clerk, in effect, appoint the printer to this House. Every body knew who would get the printing if the Clerk had any control in the matter; and the practical effect of ordering him to get it done was to allow him to appoint the public printer. To this Mr. G. was utterly opposed. If the resolution should be so modified as to require the printing to be done on the best terms, he should vote for it, otherwise he should continue his objection to its introduction.

Mr. BRIGGS now withdrew his motion to reconsider.

Mr. ADAMS, who had been entitled to the floor, having yielded it at the request of Mr. Jones, said he had done so only that an appropriation bill might be reported; but as a new subject was introduced, a debate on which might occupy the day, he claimed his right to the floor.

Mr. SERGEANT, wished him to waive his right long enough to allow Mr. S. to report a bill supplementary to the census bill.

Mr. PETRIKIN objecting to this—

Mr. ADAMS insisted on the floor, and thereupon proceeded to address the House at length in support of the following resolution, moved by him yesterday:

Resolved, That the following be added to the standing rules of this House, to be numbered the 21st:

"Every petition presented by the Speaker, or by any member, with a brief verbal statement of its contents, shall be received, unless objection be made to its reception for special reason; and whenever objection shall be made to the reception of a petition, the name of the member objecting, and the reason of the objection, shall be entered upon the journal. The question in every such case shall be, *Shall the petition be rejected?* and no petition shall be rejected but by a majority of the members present."

Mr. A. continued to speak until a few minutes past two o'clock, and, when he concluded,

The SPEAKER gave the floor to Mr. Alford, of Georgia.

Some struggle ensued as to that right; after which,

Mr. ALFORD proceeded, and addressed the House until past 3 o'clock.

Mr. HUNT, of New York, then obtained the floor; but appealed to the House, on the ground of bodily indisposition, to extend to him the indulgence which had been granted to other gentlemen, by adjournment.

And Mr. H. having submitted that motion, the yeas and nays were ordered, and, being taken, were: Yeas 85, nays 94.

So the House refused to adjourn.

Mr. HUNT again took the floor, and was proceeding to address the House—

When Mr. MONROE rose and said he was sure the House could not have heard the reason which his colleague had assigned for the motion he had made, or that they would have accorded the indulgence which was asked. He moved that the House do now adjourn.

Which motion was agreed to, and the House adjourned.

Thursday, January 23d.

The unfinished business was the resolution of Mr. Waddy Thompson to append the rules by adding thereto the following:

"Upon the presentation of any memorial or petition praying for the abolition of slavery or the slave-trade in any District, Territory, or State of the Union, and upon the presentation of any resolution or other paper touching that subject, the reception of such memorial, petition, resolution, or paper shall be considered as objected to, and the question of its reception shall be laid on the table, without debate or further action thereon."

As a substitute for which proposition, Mr. Adams heretofore moved the following:

Resolved, That the following be added to the standing rules of this House, to be numbered the 21st:

"Every petition presented by the Speaker, or by any member, with a brief verbal statement of its contents, shall be received, unless objection be made to its reception for special reasons; and whenever objection shall be made to the reception of a petition, the name of the member objecting, and the reason of the objection, shall be entered upon the journal. The question in every such case shall be, *Shall the petition be rejected?* and no petition shall be rejected but by a majority of the members present."

(Continued on Second Page.)

ADVERTISEMENTS

HORACE C. GROSVENOR,
ENGRAVER,
South side Third st., opposite the Post Office,
(Up Stairs.)
CINCINNATI OHIO.

NOTICE--BOOKS WANTED.

Rev. Jas. Duncan, (father of Dr. Duncan, member of Congress for this district,) was the author of several works; among which were, "A Treatise on Slavery," one on the "Atonement," and one on "Civil Government." If any person knows where any of the writings of the above Rev. Jas. Duncan are to be had, they will confer a great favor on the subscriber by giving him the information, or forwarding him one or more copies.

J. BLANCHARD.

P. S. Some of the above author's works were printed in Ohio, one at Vevay, Ia., 1824.

RAYNE & CURTIS,
WHOLESALE AND RETAIL
BOOT AND SHOE DEALERS;

Keep constantly on hand a large assortment of Ladies' and Gentlemen's Boots and Shoes of every description and of the very best manufacture. Purchasers at wholesale or retail will please call and examine our stock before purchasing elsewhere.

(SIGN OF THE RED BOOT)
148 *Main street, between 4th & 5th,*
Cincinnati, Oct. 9, 1839. 32–tf

CATALOGUE OF PUBLICATIONS.

For sale at the Ohio Anti-Slavery Depository, Main street between 4th and 5th, East side, (Up stairs.)

Anti-Slavery Examiner, containing A. E. Grimke's Appeal, Smith to Smylie, Power, of Congress, Bible against Slavery, Emancipation in the West Indies, Elmore and Birney, and Letter of G. Smith to Henry Clay, all in one volume.

Anti-slavery Manual; Alton Riots; Anti-slavery Record, vol 1 & 2; Appeal by Mrs. Child; Bourne's Picture of slavery; Charles Ball; Chloe Spear; Chandler's Prose and Poetical works; Emancipation in West Indies, by Thome and Kimball; Fountain; Gustavus Vassa; History of Pennsylvania Hall; Jay's View of the action of the Federal Government in behalf of Slavery; Light and Truth; Law of Slavery 8 vo.; Memoir of E. P. Lovejoy; Memoir of P. Wheatly a Native African; Negro Pew; Poems by Phillis Wheatly, a slave; Quarterly A S Magazine; Rankin's Letters; Right and Wrong in Boston; Slavery, containing Declaration of Sentiments and Constitution of American A S Soc.; Wesley's Thoughts; Does the Bible sanction Slavery?; Address to the Synod of Kentucky, Narrative of Amos Dresser and Why work for the slave? bound in one volume; Testimony of God against slavery; Tracts, miniature series bound, containing St. Domingo; Caste; Colonization; Moral condition of slaves; What is Abolition? The ten Commandments; Slavery dangerous and Emancipation safe; Pro-slavery Bible; Prejudice against color; Northern dealers in slaves; Slavery and Missions, and Dr. Nelson's Lecture on Slavery; Wesley's Thoughts, pocket edition in muslin; Whittier's Poems.

American Slavery AS IT IS; Anti-Slavery Almanac for 1840; Address to the churches of Jesus Christ, by the Evangelical Union A. S. Society; Anti-Slavery catechism; Anecdotes of American Slavery; Appeal to the Christian women of the south; Adam's speech on the Right of the People to petition, on the freedom of speech and debate, on the Resolutions of seven state Legislatures and on the Annexation of Texas; Address to such Americans as VALUE their RIGHTS and DARE maintain them, and a large number of other publications too numerous to mention.

HUGH GLASGOW,
VENITIAN BLIND MANUFACTURER.
Fifth Street between Vine and Race.
CINCINNATI.

MORUS MULTICAULIS FOR SALE.

I will contract to sell, and deliver in October or November from 20,000 to 30,000 Morus Multicaulis trees of my own growth which measure from 3 to 6 or 7 feet in height. They are remarkably healthy, and vigorous plants, and warranted genuine. Orders for the Southern, Mexican and Texian Markets shall be immediately attended to.

THOMAS EMERY.
No. 11 East Fourth st. Cincinnati.

TREES.

The subscribers have on hand and will continue to receive supplies of the Morus Multicaulis which they will sell to suit purchasers.

HEATON AND WEAVER.
Salem, Columbiana Co. O. Sept. 10 1830.

EDWARD NEVERS,
COPPER-PLATE PRINTER,
No. 106 Main, a few doors above Third Street,
Cincinnati.

JOHN H. LOVEJOY,
ENGRAVER,
106 Main Street, *Third Story,*
CINCINNATI.

COLORED SCHOOL.

The subscriber has been teaching a school for about a year and a half for the colored people in German township Darke co. Ohio.

A few young men and women can find accommodations on reasonable terms.

It is intended to commence the winter term about the first of November. Competent instruction with be provided for all who may attend.

E. S. GRUMLEY.
September 17th, 1839. 30–*tf.*

M. T. & R. GLASGOW,
SASH & BLIND MANUFACTURERS,
Eighth st. between Main & Walnut south side.
October 29th, 1839. 34—tf

TO THE PUBLIC.

The subscriber feels gratified in being able to publish the following certificate. He would just state that he keeps constantly on hand an assortment of BOOTS and SHOES, of as good quality in all respects, as the workmanship recommended in the certificate below.

JAMES ESHELBY, 186 Main st.

CERTIFICATE.

This is to certify that the sewed Boots, manufactured by James Eshelby, were considered the best work of the kind exhibited at the second annual Fair of the Ohio Mechanics' Institute, held in June, 1839.

John A. Wiseman,
G. W. Phillips, } Judges.
Jesse O'Neil,
John P. Foote, President,
aug 10 L. T. Wells, Secretary.

SLAVERY AS IT IS.

A new supply of this invaluable work just received at the Ohio Anti-Slavery Depository—Send in your orders and keep it circulating.

Also, **1,000** copies "LIBERTY" at 12 1-2 per copy.
October 29th, 1839.

Mr. Editor:—Please cut from your exchange paper, the Quincy (Ill.) Whig, a gratuitous testimonial of the *genuine* Tomato *medicine* by Doctors Eel & Nichols, which appear in that paper under date March 30, and oblige the Proprietors.

MILES' COMPOUND EXTRACT OF TOMAT.

Having used to some extent for the year past, *Miles' Compound Tomato Pills*, and having learned the ingredients of which the pills are composed, we are satisfied they will prove a beneficial remedy, when judiciously administered, and feel safe in recommending them to the public as a safe, convenient, and useful medicine, and a valuable substitute for Calomel.

RICHARD EELLS, M. D.
ADAM NICHOLS, M. D.
Quincy, Illinois, March 27, 1839 13—

MORUS MULTICAULIS.

The Subscribers have several Thousand growing prosperously in the neighborhood of Cincinnati. Persons wishing to make purchases for next year, may address (post paid)

JAMES G. BIRNEY, *New York,*
21–2mo. WM. A. BLACKNEY, *Cincinnati.*

ON LOW SPIRITS.

Low spirits is a certain state of the mind accompanied by indigestion, wherein the greatest evils are apprehended upon the slightest grounds, and the worst consequences imagined. Ancient medical writers supposed this disease to be confined to those particular regions of the abdomen technically called hypochondria which are situated on the right or left side of that cavity, whence comes the name hypodriasis.

Symptoms.—The common corporeal symptoms are flatulency in the stomach or bowels, acrid eructations, costiveness, spasmodic pains and often an utter inability of fixing the attention upon any subject of importance or engaging in any thing that demands vigour or courage. Also languidness—the mind becomes irritable, thoughtful, desponding, melancholly and dejected, accompanied by a total derangement of the nervous system. The mental feelings and peculiar train of ideas that haunt the imagination and overwhelm the judgement, exhibit an infinite diversity. The wisest and best of men are as open to this affliction as the weakest.

Causes.—A sedentary life of any kind especially severe study, protracted to a late hour in the night, and rarely relieved by social intercourse or exercise, a dissolute habit, great excess in eating or drinking, immoderate use of mercury, violent purgatives, the suppression of some habitual discharge, (as the obstruction of the mensus) or more important organs within the abdomen is frequent cause.

Treatment.—The principal objects of treatment are, to remove indigestion, strengthen the body, and enliven the spirits, which may be promoted by exercise early hours, regular meals, pleasant conversation—the bowels (if costiva) should be carefully regulated by the occasional use of a mild aperient. We know nothing better adapted to obtain this end, than Dr. Wm. Evans' Aperient Pills—being mild and certain in their operation. The bowels being once cleansed his inestimable Camomile Pills—(which are tonic, anodyne, and anti-spasmodic) are an infalliable remedy, and without dispute have proved a great blessing to the numerous public.

Some physicians have recommended a free use of mercury, but it should not be resorted to: in many cases it greatly aggravates the symptoms.

Dr. Wm. Evans, Camomile and Family Aperient Pills for sale by his several agents throughout the Union. See list of agents in this paper.

Price 75 cts. a package, which contains a bottle of Camomile Pills and a box of Aperient Pills.

CAUTION.

Dr. Wm. Evans will not be responsible for the genuineness of the Camomile Pills unless they are bought of Dr. Evans' advertised agents. There is one agent in every county. Buy of none but agents, as many druggists who are otherwise respectable, have imposed upon the invalid by selling a spurious article. Wholesale druggists are not Dr. Evans' agents; therefore respectable dealers in the country ought not to get a spurious article of them, but write for the genuine to 100 Chatham street, N. Y., where the Pills are manufactured and sold wholesale. Only place in Louisville for the sale of his celebrated medicines, is at his General Western Office, 47 Wall street, Louisville, Ky.

HIGHLY IMPORTANT.

Nervous diseases, liver complaint, dyspepsia, billious diseases, piles, consumption, coughs, colds, spitting of blood, pain in the chest and side, ulcers, female weakness, mercurial diseases, and all hypochondriacism, low spirits, palpitation of the heart, nervous weakness, fluor albus; seminal weakness, indigestion, loss of appetite, heart burn, general debility, bodily weakness, chiorosis or green sickness, flatulency, hysterical faintings, hysterics, headaches, hiccup, sickness, night mare, rheumatism, asthma, tic doulouroux, cramp, spasmodic affections, and those who are victims to that most excruciating disorder, Gout, will find relief from their sufferings by a course of Dr. Wm. Evans medicine.

Also, nausea, vomiting, pains in the side, limbs, head, stomach or back, dimness or confusion of sight, noises in the inside, alternate flushes of heat and chillness, tremors, watchings, agitation, anxiety, bad dreams, spasms.

Principal Office 100 Chatham street, New York.

THE FOLLOWING

Interesting and astonishing facts, are amongst the numerous Cures performed by the use of Dr. Wm. Evans' Medicines.

Principal Office, 100 Catham street, New York, where the Dr. may be consulted personally or by letter (post paid) from any part of the United States. &c. Persons requiring medicines and advice, must enclose a bank note, or order.

CERTIFICATES.

More Conclusive proofs of the extraordinary efficacy of Dr. Wm. Evans' celebrated Camomile and Aperient Antibillious Pills, in alleviating afflicted mankind.—Mr. Robert Cameron, 101 Bowery. Disease, Chronic Dysentery, or Bloody Flux. Symptoms, unusual flatulency in the bowels severe griping, frequent inclination to go to stool, tenesmus, loss of appetite, nausea, vomiting, frequency of pulse, and a frequent discharge of a peculiarly fœtid matter, mixed with blood, great debility, sense of burning heat, with an intolerable bearing down of the parts. Mr. Cameron is enjoying perfect health, and returned his sincere thanks for the extraordinary benefit he had received.

☞Asthma. *Three years standing.*—Mr. Robert Monroe, Schuylkill, afflicted with the above distressing malady. Symptoms, great languor, flatulency, disturbed rest, nervous headache, difficulty of breathing, tightness and stricture across the breast, dizziness, nervous irritability and restlessness, could not lie in a horizontal position without the sensation of impending suffocation, palpitation of the heart, distressing cough, costiveness, pain of the stomach; drowsiness, great debility and deficiency of the nervous energy. Mr. R. Monroe gave up every thought of recovery, and dire despair set on the countenance of every person interested in his existence or happiness, till by accident he noticed in a public paper some cures effected by Dr. Wm. Evans' Medicine in his complaint, which induced him to purchase a package of the pills which resulted in completely removing every symptom of his disease. He wishes to say his motive for this declaration is, that those afflicted with the same or any symptoms similar to those from which he is happily restored, may likewise receive the same inestimable benefit.

Liver Complaint—Ten years standing.—Mrs Hannah Browne, wife of Joseph Browne, North Sixth street near Second street, Williamsburg, afflicted for the last ten years with Liver Complaint restored to health through the treatment of Dr. Wm. Evans. Symptoms: Habitual constipation of the bowels, total loss of appetite, excruciating pain of the epigastric region, great depression of spirits, languor and other symptoms of extreme debility, disturbed sleep, inordinate flow of the menses, pain in the right side, could not lay on her left side without an aggravation of the pain, urine high colored, with other symptoms indicating great derangement of the functions of the liver.

Mrs. Browne was attended by three of the first physicians, but received no relief from their medicine, till Mrs. Browne procured some of Dr. Wm. Evans invaluable preparations, which effectually relieved her of the above distressing symptoms, with others, which it is not essential to intimate.

JOSEPH BROWNE.

City and County of New York. SS.

Joseph Browne, Williamsburgh, Long Island, being duly sworn, did depose and say that the facts set forth in the within statement, to which he has subscribed his name, are just and true.

JOSEPH BROWNE,
Husband of Hannah Browne.

Sworn before me this 4th day of January, 1837.

PETER PINCKNEY, Com. of Deeds.

☞Another recent test of the unrivalled virtues of Dr. Wm. Evans' Medicines.—*Dyspepsia, ten years standing.*—Mr. J. M. Kenzie, 176 Stanton street was afflicted with the above complaint for ten years, which incapacitated him at intervals, for the period of six years, in attending to his business, restored to perfect health under the salutary treatment of Dr. Wm. Evans.

The symptoms were, a sense of distension and oppression after eating, pain in the pit of the stomach, nausea, impaired appetite, giddiness, palpitation of the heart, great debility and emaciation, depression of spirits, disturbed rest, sometimes a bilious vomiting and pain in the right side, an extreme degree of languor and faintness; any endeavor to pursue his business causing immediate exhaustion and weariness.

Mr. McKenzie is daily attending to his business, and none of the above symptoms have recurred since he used the medicine. He is now a strong and healthy man. He resorted to myriads of remedies, but they were all ineffectual. He is willing to give any information to the afflicted respecting the inestimable benefit rendered to him by the use of Dr. Wm. Evans' medicine.

An extraordinary and remarkable cure.—Mrs. Mary Dillon, Williamsburgh, corner of Fourth and North streets, completely restored to health by the treatment of Dr. Wm. Evans, 100 Chatham street.

The symptoms of the distressing case were as follows: Total loss of appetite palpitation of the heart, twiching of the tendons, with a general spasmodic affection of the muscles, difficulty of breathing, giddiness, langour, lassitude great depression of spirits, with a fear of some impending evil, a sensation of fluttering in the pit of the stomach, irregular transient pains in different parts, great emaciation, with other symptoms of extreme debility.

The above case was pronounced hopeless by three of the most eminent physicians, and the dissolution of the patient awaited by her friends, who were in attendance. She has given her cheerful permission to publish the above facts, and will also gladly give any information to any inquiring mind.

MARY DILLON.

Dyspepsia and Hypocondriacism.—Interesting case.—Mr. William Salmen, Green street, above Third, Philadelphia, afflicted for several years with the following distressing symptoms. Sickness at the stomach, headache, dizziness, palpitation of the heart, impaired appetite and weakness of the extremeties emancipation and general debility, disturbed rest, a sense of pressure and weight at the stomach after eating, nightmare, great mental despondency, severe flying pains, in the chest back and side, costiveness, a dislike for society, or conversation, involuntary sighing, and weeping, languor and lassitude upon the least exercise.

Mr. Solomon had applied to the most eminent physicians who considered it beyond the power of medicine to restore him to health; however as his affliction had reduced him to a very deplorable condition, and having been recommended by a relative of his to make trial of Dr. Wm. Evans medicine, he with difficulty repaired to the office and procured a package to which, he says he is indebted for his restoration of life, health and friends. He is now enjoying all the blessings of health.

Persons desirous of further information, will be satisfied in every particular as to this astonishing cure at Dr. Wm. Evans' Medicine Office, 100 Chatham street New York.

Mrs. Anne F. Kenny, No. 115 Lewis street, between Stanton and Houston, afflicted for ten years with the following distressing symptoms: Acid, eructation, daily spasmodic, pains in the head, loss of appetite, palpitation of her heart, giddiness and dimness of sight, could not lie on her right side, disturbed rest, utter inability of engaging in any thing that demanded vigor or courage, sometimes a visionary idea of an aggravation of her disease, a whimsical aversion to particular persons and places, groundless apprehensions of personal danger and poverty, an irksomeness and weariness of life, discontented, disquietude on every slight occasion, she conceived she could neither die nor live; most miserable life, never was any one so bad, with frequent mental hallucinations.

Mr. Kenny had the advice of several eminent physicians, and had recourse to numerous medicines but could not obtain even temporary alleviation of her distressing state, till her husband persuaded her to make trial of my mode of treatment.

She is now quite relieved and finds herself not only capable of attending to her domestic affairs, but avows that she enjoys as good health at present as she did at any period of her existence.

J. Kenny, husband of the aforesaid Anne Kanny.

Sworn before me, this 14th day of December, 1836.

PETER PINCKNEY, Com. of Deeds.

A letter from Mr. Sheldon P. Gilbert to Dr. Wm. Evans, proprietor of the celebrated Camomile Pills:

Dear Sir—Had the immortal Cowper known the medical qualities of the Camomile Plant, he as well as thousands since (besides myself,) would have experienced its wonderful effects on the nervous system. The public utility of Cowper was blighted in the bud, through the natural effect of his nervous debility upon the mental powers, which made it necessary for him to seek relief beneath the rural shade, but the calm retreat gave his physical nature no repose. If some one then had known the secret of concentrating the medical virtues of Camomile, the discoverer would have been immortalized with poetic zeal as the benefactor of suffering men.

The above lines were prompted from the effect I have experienced from Dr. Wm. Evans' Camomile Pills.

Yours, with esteem, SHELDON G. GILBERT.
Durham, Greene County, New York.

Dr. Wm. Evans' celebrated medicine for sale at his principal office 100 Chatham st. New York. General Western office 47 Wall st., Louisville, Ky.,—and by S. C. Parkhurst, 23 Lower Market st., Cincinnati, and by L. D. Barker, Mc Connelsville; Simpson and Seaman, Malta. E. Short and Co., Lowell. J. Mills and Co., Marietta. D. Barber, Chester. H. R. Gilmore, Athens. Myers, Crum and Fall, Nelsonville. Myers, Fall and Doty, Logan. Rogers, Martin and Co., Circleville. Webster, Melwin and Co., Washington. Wm. Hibben, Wilmington. F. and A. S. Evans, Hillsboro. Wm. Bell, Greenfield. C. and N. Bell, Bainbridge. J. P. Campbell Chillicothe. Elias Long, Jackson. Turner and Porter Piketon. Culbertson and Chambers, West Union. Murphy and Ridgway, Ripley. Maklan and Barns, Georgetown. White, Thomas and Co., Batavia. Geo. Hardy, Lebanon. Jno. Hivling and Co., Xenia. A. Mattox and Co., Springfield. T. H. Stevens, Urbana. McIlvain and Harriott, Maysville. Brown and Welch, Delaware. J. D. Butler, Marion. Walker and Spining, Bellefontaine. Hugh Thompson, Sidney. Wm. Scott, Piqua. Fuller and Day, Troy. Enyart and Adly, Middletown. Cyrus Johnson, Franklin. Saml. Shoup, Dayton. Matthias Reiser and Co., Rossville. Earhart and Tapscott, Hamilton. J. G. Moore, Madison, Ia. Tuly and Pennington, New Albany, and by Dr. Wm. Evans' advertised agents in all the principal towns in the United States.

BEDSTEADS.

New and Important patented right & left wood screw and swelled rail beadsteads manufactured on the corner of Eighth *and* Broadway by H. Boyd, warranted to be the best and most convenient bedstead ever in use. Orders for the above article, may be addressed to

Cincinnati, Aug. 6, 1839. HENRY BOYD.
26—tf.

PIANO FORTES.

Of very superior style, from the House of Stoddard & Co., N. York, also a large and fashionable assortment of Vocal and Instrumental Music, just received by Miss Blackwell, and for sale at her residence on East Third st., between Lawrence and Pike.

January 21,
1—tf.

DAVIS & DODD'S HATS.
For elegance and durability, inferior to none. Try them and be satisfied.
Corner Main and Fifth Streets.

C. DONALDSON & CO.
IMPORTERS & DEALERS IN HARDWARE
CUTLERY, in all its Varieties.
No. 18 Main street, Cincinnati

N. B—A large assortment of the above goods kept constantly on hand, which they offer for sale, Wholesale and Retail on the most favorable terms.

48—tf.

CAUTION.

The season of the year is approaching when coughs and colds are prevalent. How many of our citizens, in apparent good health at this time, will, the ensuing winter, by exposure, imprudence, and more than all, neglect, lay the foundation of an incurable affection of the lungs. No medicine has yet been discovered that so uniformly succeeds in removing diseases from the lungs, as "Watasia," Even in some apparently hopeless cases, by the use of this medicine, restoration to health has been perfect.

Every family should provide themselves with so invaluable a remedy.

For sale at W. PECK, & Co's. Drug store, 19 Main st. 4 doors north of Front, Cincinnati, and at the principal drug stores in this city and the United States.

November, 12, 1839. 36—*tf*

Anti-slavery Almanacs, for 1840.

Just arrived and for sale at the Ohio Anti-Slavery Depository. Let every Abolitionist take measures to give it a wide and thorough circulation. It contains 48 pages, with 14 "pictorials," all for 6 1-4 cents being double the matter, at half the price of many kinds offered to the public.

NEW MAP OF OHIO.

This new and splendid Map is now in the course of delivery, and subscribers will be furnished as fast as the agent can supply them.

Extract from the Report of the Committee of the Trustees and Visitors of common schools of Cincinnati.

"That they have carefully examined said Map, and the highly respectable testimonials in its favor and do not hesitate in saying that we believe it to be one of the best executed and most correct Maps of our state that we have ever seen." * * * *

"*Resolved*, That the President be authorised to purchase thirty copies of Doolittle & Munson's Map of Ohio, for the use of the common schools of Cincinnati." Which report was accepted and resolution unanimously adopted, March 12, 1839.

Columbus, June, 8, 1838.

In compliance with the provisions of an act of the General Assembly passed Jan. 27, 1838. We have examined and do approve of Doolittle & Munsons Map of Ohio.

JOSEPH VANCE, *Gov. of Ohio.*
Carter B. Harlan, *Sec. of State;*

The above Map is for sale at the publishers rooms (up stairs) corner of Main and 5th st. Cincinnati. Also sectional Maps of Iowa, and Wisconsin Territories, pocket maps of Indiana, Illinois, and Kentucky. Mitchels large Maps of the United States, and World, large Maps of Indiana.

FARMS FOR SALE.

A good fair of 160 acres, situated 8 miles from town, having 80 acres in cultivation, a frame house with 6 rooms, a hall and a cellar; also, two substantial frame barns, a large stable, a spring house, a smoke house, and other out buildings: likewise, a garden, a summer house, a good orchard, of various kinds of choice fruit trees, two wells and many spsings. The land is good and well situated for cultivation.

A fertile farm of 60 or 123 acres, situated upon a good road, 7 miles from town, with about half in tillage, frame house having 4 rooms and a cellar, a commodious frame barn, a cider house with a mill, a good orchard and several springs. The land is first rate, and consists of hill and bottom.

A fertile farm of 337 acres, situated 12 miles from town upon, a turnpike road, having 160 acres in cultivation, a frame house having 8 rooms and a cellar; also, a brick house with 3 rooms, a cellar, a milk house, three frame barns, and other buildings; likewise two good orchards, an excellent garden, having strawberry beds, currant and goosberry bushes, and various ornamental shrubs. The land is rich, and consists of bottom and upland; it is well watered with springs, a creek and a well.

A farm of 120 acres situated 15 miles from town, upon the the Ohio, having a frame house with 5 rooms. There are 40 acres in cultivation, 25 rich bottom, and the rest good upland. It will be sold low for cash.

A Desirable Country Seat, situated 6 miles from town, upon a good road, having 26 acres of land, 15 of which are in cultivation; also a new frame house with 4 rooms, a hall, a kitchen, a cellar and a porch; likewise a wood house, a spring and a garden with 30 choice fruit trees. The land is good and well located for culture. It will be sold low for goods.

A desirable Farm of 178 acres, situated in Indiana, 18 miles above Louisville, having 70 to 80 acres in culture, a a good brick house with 7 rooms and a cellar, a commodious frame barn, with a stable and carriage house, a stone milk house, a good orchard of choice fruit trees of various sorts, and a superior garden abounding with flowers and fruit trees of select kinds. The land is excellent and very well situated for cultivation.

City property will be taken in payment for these farms.

Apply to THOMAS EMERY,
Estate and Money Agent, No 11,
December, 17,—40, tf. East Fourth street.

MONEY IN ENGLAND.

Persons wishing to procure money from any part of England, Wales, Ireland, and Scotland, by instructing their friends to remit it through their Bankers to the account of *Thomas Emery with Messrs. Baring Brothers & Co. London* can receive the cash in Cincinnati, or elsewhere if desired, as soon as advised. When the money is paid to the English Bankers, the names of the parties for whose use it is designed must be particularly stated.

THOMAS EMERY, *Estate and Money Agent*, 11 *East Fourth St*

Miles's Compound Extract of
TOMATO PILLS.

WE are happy to acknowledge the growing interest manifested by an enlightened and discriminating public in the success of the TOMATO Medicine.

The fact that we make known to the faculty its elements and explain to them, upon inquiry, every thing in relation to the *modus operandi*, which it is all-essential should be known, to enable the physician to understand fully what he is prescribing, and of course to know the results, which should follow, with the same degree of certainty, that he can know them in the administration of any other article removes from it every suspicion of quackery, and places it on a par with other important remedial agents. Consequently there is no physician who, having tested its operation and efficacy in the removal of disease, may not prescribe the Compound Tomato Extract with as much propriety as he can prescribe a preparation which he has himself compounded.

To puff our medicine into general use, has never made any part of our plan of action; and our friends who have noticed our communications, will absolve us of any such attempt. We believe it to possess as valuable medical properties, and as great a therapeutic influence over the system, as any other simple or compound preparation to be found in the materia medica. But it has been our object to bring it before the public, principally by means of submitting it to the scrutiny and experience of those whom us necessarily be the best judges of its intrinsic merits—the physicians. We were willing, after a fair trial, to abide by their decision, and we have not been disappointed in the result.

Unlike the thousand secret nostrums of the day, this article does not fear the scrutiny and investigation of physicians, but rather courts it. If, therefore, there is any compound preparation put up for general and family use which should be encouraged and extensively patronized by the medical profession, it is the genuine Tomato Medicine and we trust we shall, ere long, have the satisfaction of seeing it in general use, and its excellence duly appreciated by all, whose opinion is of any value, however sceptical and prejudiced they may be at present. 11—

April 9th, 1839.